

---

# **An Evaluation of the Comprehensive Guidance Program in Utah Public Schools**

---

Prepared for:

Utah State Office of Education  
Scott W. Bean, State Superintendent  
Robert O. Brems, Associate Superintendent  
R. Lynn Jensen, Coordinator, Integrated Curriculum and Student Services  
Judy Petersen, Specialist, Comprehensive Guidance

Prepared by:

IBRIC  
Institute for Behavioral Research in Creativity  
David E. Nelson, Senior Research Scientist  
John L. Gardner, Project Manager  
March 1998

## Overview of Study I and Study II

The Utah State Office of Education commissioned the Institute for Behavioral Research in Creativity (IBRIC) to conduct a statewide evaluation of Utah's Comprehensive Guidance program. The evaluation consisted of two studies. In study I, surveys and interviews were conducted to determine how the program had been implemented throughout the state. In study II, high implementation Comprehensive Guidance schools were identified and contrasted with low implementation schools.

As part of study I, a survey of Comprehensive Guidance programs throughout the state of Utah was conducted in October and November of 1997. The survey was conducted to determine the impacts of more fully implemented Comprehensive Guidance programs on the Student Education and Occupation Plan (SEOP) process and related indicators in Utah public schools.

Each school that had qualified to receive Comprehensive Guidance funding prior to October 1, 1997 was invited to participate in the study. Each qualifying school received a packet from the Utah State Office of Education (USOE). The packet included surveys to be completed by the counseling department, the principal, and three randomly selected teachers. Participation in the survey was exceptional. Of the 193 schools that received packets, 176 responded before December 2, 1997, a return rate of 91 percent. Ten schools were also interviewed as part of the study.

Study results indicated that Comprehensive Guidance has had a major impact on many indicators in the participating schools. The most profound impacts were on the following areas: student planning, extent of counseling and guidance services offered in schools, and coordination within schools. Comprehensive Guidance has also had a positive impact on parental involvement in schools, the job definition and productivity of counselors, career exploration, information management, and the development and delivery of guidance curriculum.

Study results also identified areas in which the Comprehensive Guidance program can improve. In many schools, time management is a major obstacle to increasing program success. Also, many schools have been hampered by an ineffective flow of funds, lack of budget information, and lack of personnel.

Clearly, not all Comprehensive Guidance schools have implemented the program to the same level. Some schools have been more successful than others have. The purpose of study II was to determine what impact the level of implementation of Comprehensive Guidance in individual schools has had on important descriptors of student success and other characteristics.

An analysis of the data revealed that students in high implementing schools a) rated their overall educational preparation as more adequate, b) rated their job preparation as better, and c) rated guidance and career planning services in the schools as higher.

In addition, students in high implementing schools a) took more advanced mathematics and science courses, b) took more vocational /technical courses, and c) had higher ACT scores in every area of the test. Finally, fewer students in high implementing schools described their high school program as "general."

## **Study I**

---

# **The Implementation and Impact of the Comprehensive Guidance Program on Utah Public Schools**

---

### ***Prepared for:***

The Utah State Office of Education  
Scott W. Bean, State Superintendent of Public Education  
Robert O. Brems, Associate Superintendent, Applied Technology Education  
R. Lynn Jensen, Coordinator, Integrated Curriculum and Student Services  
Judy Peterson, Specialist, Comprehensive Guidance

### ***Prepared by:***

IBRIC  
The Institute for Behavioral Research in Creativity  
David E. Nelson, Senior Research Scientist  
John L. Gardner, Project Manager

March, 1998

## Table of Contents

Objective of Study I.....	1
Method .....	1
Participants.....	1
Survey Instruments .....	2
Procedure .....	2
Results .....	2
Most Widely and Least Widely Implemented Program Components .....	2
Successes, Obstacles, and Suggested Improvements .....	3
Program Successes.....	3
Obstacles to Success .....	3
Suggested Improvements.....	4
Job Satisfaction .....	4
Job Performance .....	4
Program Implementation: An In-Depth Interview Perspective.....	4
Viewpoints: Teachers, Principals, and Counselors .....	5
Middle Schools and High Schools .....	5
Table 1 – Most Widely Implemented Program Components .....	6
Table 2 – Least Widely Implemented Components .....	8
Table 3 – <u>Program Successes</u> : Main Categories of Responses to Open-Ended Question.....	10
Table 4 – <u>Obstacles to Successes</u> : Main Categories of Responses to Open-Ended Question .....	11
Table 5 – <u>Suggested Improvements</u> : Main Categories of Responses to Open-Ended Question.....	12
Table 6 – <u>Job Satisfaction</u> : Main Categories of Responses to Open-Ended Question .....	13
Table 7 – <u>Job Performance</u> : Main Categories of Responses to Open-Ended Question .....	14
Table 8 – <u>Unique Documents</u> : Main Categories of Responses to Open-Ended Question.....	15



Table 9 – Small Group SEOP Conferences: High Student Attendance .....	16
Table 10 – Individual SEOP Conferences: An Increase in Student Attendance .....	17
Table 11 – SEOP Conferences: An Increase in Parent Attendance.....	18
Detailed Discussion of Combined Results .....	19
Major Program Successes: Based on All Study Sources.....	19
Student Planning.....	19
Extent of Services.....	20
Program Coordination .....	21
Parental Involvement.....	22
Policy and Job Definition .....	22
Departmental Productivity .....	23
Career Exploration .....	23
Information Management .....	24
Clarity of Purpose .....	24
Guidance Curriculum .....	24
Major Areas for Improvement: Based on All Study Sources .....	25
Time Management .....	25
Funding .....	26
Personnel Management.....	26
Program Support .....	27
Program Coordination .....	28
Teacher Preparation.....	32
Use of SEOP information.....	29
Use of Career Exploration Resources .....	30
Community Involvement.....	30
Strategies for Continued Success .....	31

Parental Involvement.....	31
Use of the Career Center .....	31
Student Interest in the SEOP Process .....	31
Course Taking .....	32
Post-Secondary Plans .....	32
Conclusions .....	33



# STUDY I

## THE IMPLEMENTATION AND IMPACT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE GUIDANCE PROGRAM ON UTAH PUBLIC SCHOOLS

### Objective of Study I

Since its inception, Utah's Comprehensive Guidance program has aimed to enable counselors to eliminate non-guidance activities and increase direct services to students. Direct services include the elements of student planning, guidance curriculum, and responsive services.

Over the past several years, the program has expanded and evolved in many ways. The Utah State Office of Education has made consistent efforts to get more secondary schools involved in the Comprehensive Guidance program and to continue improving existing programs. From the Fall of 1994 to the Fall of 1997, the number of schools that had qualified for program funding increased from 49 to 193. In 1997, USOE also began piloting the Comprehensive Guidance program in several elementary schools. Changes in state legislation have also affected Comprehensive Guidance by increasing the emphasis on the Student Education and Occupation Plan (SEOP) process. These and other changes have affected how the program is perceived and how it is implemented in schools. The purpose of this study was to determine how Comprehensive Guidance has been implemented and how the program has impacted SEOP processes and products as well as the delivery of guidance curriculum and responsive services at participating schools.

### Method

#### *Participants*

All Utah public secondary schools that had qualified to receive Comprehensive Guidance funding before October 1, 1997 were invited to participate in the study. Each school received a set of surveys to be completed by the counseling department, the principal, and three randomly selected teachers. Of the 193 targeted schools, 176 responded to the survey before December 2, 1997. The participation rate of 91 percent provided a broad indication of how Comprehensive Guidance had been implemented across the state.

Counselors from ten Comprehensive Guidance schools were also interviewed by the authors and USOE personnel to provide more detailed and open-ended information about how the program has impacted their schools.

### *Survey Instruments*

Three survey forms were developed for this study: a counselor form, a principal form, and a teacher form. Each form used the same basic format, which included several types of items. The majority of the items required respondents to indicate the accuracy of various statements in describing their programs. Other items allowed respondents to rate district performance, indicate student and parent involvement levels, etc. Survey participants recorded their responses to these items on answer sheets that were optically scanned by IBRIC personnel. (See Appendices A, B, and C for the actual survey forms).

In addition to the multiple-choice items, each survey form included several open-ended questions. Responses to these items were summarized and categorized.

### *Procedure*

The survey forms were developed by a committee that included USOE and IBRIC personnel. To construct the surveys, the committee used the state's Comprehensive Guidance and Counseling Information Guide and results from a previous study. Survey forms were also reviewed by three counselors who served on Utah's Comprehensive Guidance Advisory Committee.

USOE mailed one packet of materials to each of the 193 targeted schools. Each packet included five large envelopes addressed to the counselors, the principal, and three teachers. The counseling department was asked to distribute the envelopes to the other participants. Counselors then collected the sealed responses from the principal and three teachers and mailed those envelopes along with their own survey responses to IBRIC. Special school codes were placed on the survey forms to protect the anonymity of survey respondents.

### **Results**

This study was primarily designed to answer the following question: How has the implementation of Comprehensive Guidance impacted the SEOP process and other indicators in Utah public schools? The study produced three types of data to address that question: 1) responses to multiple-choice survey questions, 2) responses to open-ended survey questions, and 3) information obtained from interviews with counselors and other personnel at ten schools.

### *Most Widely and Least Widely Implemented Program Components*

Responses to the multiple-choice survey items provided data on how different aspects of Comprehensive Guidance had been implemented across the state. (Item-level data on each survey is presented in Appendices D, E, and F.) The counselor survey and teacher survey had two types of response options: a five-point scale option and a yes or no option. For the five-point scale items, average ratings were calculated. This procedure allowed IBRIC personnel to identify which aspects of

Comprehensive Guidance had been most widely implemented throughout the state. Table 1 (located on page 6) provides a rank ordered list of the top items from each survey form. These items, labeled as the most widely implemented program components, deal predominantly with the following issues: a) creating and adhering to SEOP policy; b) informing parents, faculty members, and administrators about the program; and c) completing SEOP conferences and documentation.

The same scoring procedure was used to identify program components that had not been widely implemented across the state. Table 2 (located on page 8) provides a rank ordered list of the lowest ranking items from each survey form. These items are related to the following issues: a) the effect of Comprehensive Guidance on responsive services offered, b) use of SEOP information, c) teacher involvement in the program, and d) district and community support.

### *Successes, Obstacles, and Suggested Improvements*

Responses to open-ended survey questions provided data on the perceived successes of Comprehensive Guidance, the obstacles to greater success, suggested improvements, etc. The responses to these items were summarized and categorized. For data on the various questions asked and the categories of responses made by teachers, principals, and counselors, see Tables 3-8. (In some cases, participants listed more than one item in response to one question; consequently, the total number of responses exceeds the total number of participants.)

#### *Program Successes*

Survey participants were asked the following question: What is the most significant success of the Comprehensive Guidance program at your school? The following aspects of Comprehensive Guidance were mentioned most frequently: **Student Planning, Extent of Services, and Program Coordination**. Table 3 (on page 10) presents definitions of these and other categories in more detail.

#### *Obstacles to Success*

Survey participants were asked the following question: What has been the greatest obstacle you have had to deal with in implementing Comprehensive Guidance? The following obstacles were mentioned most frequently: **Time Management, Counselor-to-Student Ratios, and Lack of Teacher Preparation**. Counselors and teachers agreed that time management was the main obstacle to successful implementation of Comprehensive Guidance in schools. Counselors focused on diminished amount of time available for responsive services, the number of demands made on counselors without any additional support, and the time wasted in oversight. Teachers emphasized excessive busy work created by the program and too little class time available for meaningful career education. According to principals, the main obstacle to program success was insufficient personnel (low counselor-to-student ratios). Table 4 (on page 11) provides more information on the categories of responses.



### *Suggested Improvements*

Survey participants were asked the following question: What would help you most in your efforts to continue improving the existing guidance program in your school? The following improvements were mentioned most frequently: **Increased or Continued Funding, Improved Teacher Preparation, and Increased Program Support.** Counselors and principals agreed that increased or continued funding was the one thing that would help them most improve their existing guidance programs. Specifically, they noted that funding was needed to a) improve counselor-to-student ratios, b) pay for more support personnel, c) improve guidance facilities and technology, and d) provide more inservice. Teachers indicated that better teacher preparation would most improve the guidance programs in their schools. Table 5 (on page 12) provides more information on the categories of responses.

### *Job Satisfaction*

Counselors were asked how Comprehensive Guidance had affected their overall job satisfaction. Forty-eight counseling teams (27% of respondents) reported that the program had positively affected their job satisfaction by increasing their interaction with students. Conversely, forty-seven teams (27%) noted that Comprehensive Guidance had increased the stress, frustration, and fatigue that they experienced. The added stress was frequently attributed to SEOP requirements. See Table 6 (on page 13) for more information.

### *Job Performance*

Finally, counselors were asked to indicate how the emphasis that Comprehensive Guidance placed on teamwork had impacted their job performance. The most popular response was that teamwork had increased productivity through better planning. The second most popular response defined teamwork as a school-wide concept, indicating that teamwork had improved unity within the entire faculty and increased the visibility of the counseling department in the school. Table 7 (on page 14) provides more information on the categories of responses.

### *Program Implementation: An In-Depth Interview Perspective*

Notes from the ten on-site interviews were summarized into a single report. The complete summary is provided in Appendix D. The interviews supported the survey results and clarified some apparent contradictions about time management and responsive services. While most counseling departments noted an increase in productivity due to better planning and a more efficient use of time, they also experienced more demands on their time. These increased demands added stress to counselors' jobs; this stress was primarily related to a perceived inability to meet all the demands. Interviews and responses to the open-ended questions indicated that counselors most often experienced stress and frustration when their ability to provide responsive services was limited by other demands on their time.

The SEOP process and guidance curriculum increased the interaction that counselors had with **all** students. The increased interaction between counselors and students impacted responsive services in many schools. Some counselors noted that responsive services had suffered because Comprehensive

Guidance (or state legislation) overemphasized the SEOP process. This was not the case in all schools. In some schools, the increased interaction helped counselors prevent some crises and thus reduce the need for responsive services. However, counselors in other schools believed that by interacting more frequently with counselors, students feel more comfortable approaching counselors about possible problems, thus increasing the need for responsive services. Likewise, counselors in classrooms or SEOP conferences are not available for crises. Yet, counselors in classrooms help prevent crises.

### *Viewpoints: Teachers, Principals, and Counselors*

Overall, principals were much more positive than teachers and counselors in their responses to the survey questions. Teachers were the least positive group. For instance, all three groups responded to the following item: Inservice or training on the SEOP process is provided to all teachers. Ninety-five percent of principals indicated that the statement was at least "Reasonably accurate" in describing their program. However, only 81% of counselors and only 66% of teachers agreed that the statement provided a reasonably accurate description of their programs.

In other areas, there was more agreement. Ninety-two percent of high school teachers and 93% of high school principals stated that an adequate career center existed at their schools. Likewise, 59% of high school teachers and 61% of high school counselors reported that teachers receive an orientation to the career center.

### *Middle Schools and High Schools*

Survey results indicated that some real differences exist between high school and middle/junior high school Comprehensive Guidance programs. Compared to middle schools, high schools excel in the following areas: Development of career centers, use of SEOP information, teacher training, and community and local business involvement. Middle schools focus more on planning and delivering guidance curriculum and keeping all school personnel informed about the SEOP process. Interestingly, middle schools, on average, also reported that a higher percentage of their students were planning post-secondary education or training.

**Table 1**

**Most Widely Implemented Program Components**

Table 1 presents components of the Comprehensive Guidance program that were most widely implemented across the state. On the five-point scales, an average rating of 5.00 would indicate that the statement provided an "Extremely accurate" description of the program in every responding school. An average rating of 1.00 would indicate that the statement was "Not at all accurate" at any responding school. Below, the **Average Rating** of each program component across schools is listed. The **Percent Rating Statement as Accurate** column notes the percentage of respondents who indicated that the corresponding statement provided at least a "Reasonably accurate" description of the program in their school. For yes or no scales, the **Percent Agreeing** column presents the percentage of respondents who indicated that the corresponding statement described their program. At the bottom of each list (in the shaded area), the average across all program components of that survey item type is listed.

	<i>Average Rating</i> 1 = not accurate 5 = extremely accurate	<i>Percent Rating Statement as Accurate</i>
<i>Counselor Survey — Five-Point Scales</i>		
1. SEOP conferences are conducted according to policy.	4.81	100%
2. Parents are informed about the purpose of the SEOP process.	4.69	99%
3. All students receive equal treatment in the SEOP process.	4.69	97%
4. The SEOP process is clearly labeled by name and explained to parents.	4.65	99%
5. More counselor time has been devoted to SEOP activities.	4.64	98%
6. The school actively schedules SEOP conferences with parents.	4.59	98%
7. All counselors have the skills to implement a successful program.	4.58	100%
8. Students are exposed to a wide range of career options.	4.54	99%
9. The administration receives info about all changes the SEOP.	4.49	94%
10. Special population students are included in career exploration activities.	4.45	99%
11. Counselors are aware of trends in the SEOP goals of students.	4.43	98%
12. Career days, job shadowing, etc. cover a wide range of career choices.	4.33	94%
13. Parents are supportive of the SEOP process.	4.27	98%
14. Career exploration resources cover a wide range of career choices.	4.27	97%
15. Career fairs, etc. are of high quality and provide hands-on information.	4.25	93%
Average Across All Program Components	3.75	82%

Table 1 (continued)

	Average Rating 1 = not accurate 5 = extremely accurate	Percent Rating Statement as Accurate
<i>Principal Survey — Five-Point Scales</i>		
1. The principal holds counselors responsible for following SEOP policy.	4.75	99%
2. All students meet individually with a counselor every year.	4.63	97%
3. The principal makes certain that SEOP policy is implemented.	4.57	99%
4. Students formally extend and revise their SEOP every year.	4.56	99%
5. Counselor time devoted to SEOP activities has increased.	4.55	98%
Average Across All Program Components	4.05	91%
<i>Teacher Survey — Five-Point Scales</i>		
1. Administration ensures that school SEOP goals are created/supported.	3.93	93%
2. Teachers receive memos about SEOP activities.	3.87	88%
3. Teachers support goals related to the SEOP process.	3.70	93%
Average Across All Program Components	3.36	74%
<i>Counselor Survey — Yes or No</i>		Percent Agreeing
1. Results from aptitude tests/inventories are considered as students create their SEOP.		99%
2. Each counselor has received training on the SEOP process.		99%
3. Each counselor has learned the necessary skills to carry out SEOP responsibilities.		98%
4. Students formally revise and extend their SEOP every year.		96%
5. Students and counselors use a standard form for keeping SEOP information.		95%
6. Community groups provide personnel for career fairs, field trips, etc.		95%
Average Across All Program Components		73%
<i>Teacher Survey — Yes or No</i>		
1. I am familiar with the SEOP process at my school.		80%
2. All students select a career area as part of the SEOP process.		79%
3. All students develop a formal four- or five-year SEOP.		76%
Average Across All Program Components		60%

Table 2

## Least Widely Implemented Components

Table 2 presents components of the Comprehensive Guidance program that were least widely implemented across the state. On the five-point scales, an average rating of 5.00 would indicate that the statement provided an "Extremely accurate" description of the program in every responding school. An average rating of 1.00 would indicate that the statement was "Not at all accurate" at any responding school. Below, the **Average Rating** of each program component across schools is listed. The **Percent Rating Statement as Accurate** column notes the percentage of respondents who indicated that the corresponding statement provided at least a "Reasonably accurate" description of the program in their school. For yes or no scales, the **Percent Agreeing** column presents the percentage of respondents who indicated that the corresponding statement described their program. At the bottom of each list (in the shaded area), the average across all program components of that survey item type is listed.

	<i>Average Rating</i> 1 = not accurate 5 = extremely accurate	<i>Percent Rating Statement as Accurate</i>
<i>Counselor Survey — Five-Point Scales</i>		
1. The PTA helps contact and inform parents about the SEOP process.	2.21	35%
2. The amount of time dedicated to responsive services has increased.	2.40	42%
3. Students use their SEOP information on their own.	2.40	46%
4. Teachers receive an orientation to the career center.	2.72	55%
5. Students use their SEOP information during academic and ATE classes.	2.82	57%
6. Students use the career center outside of regular classes.	2.84	57%
7. Career center can accommodate number of students in a typical class.	2.93	56%
8. Time needed for the SEOP does not infringe on responsive services.	2.93	57%
9. District modifies course offerings, etc. to meet student needs.	3.02	65%
10. Students' school-to-careers activities are linked to their career goals.	3.08	64%
11. Students make specific plans for post-secondary education or training.	3.15	72%
12. All students receive a formal orientation to the career center.	3.21	66%
13. Students access SEOP info. w/ counselors outside the SEOP conference.	3.23	70%
14. The district solicits input about budget needs.	3.25	70%
15. The administration requires inservice on the SEOP process.	3.26	66%
Average Across All Program Components	3.75	82%

Table 2 (continued)

	Average Rating 1 = not accurate 5 = extremely accurate	Percent Rating Statement as Accurate
<i>Principal Survey — Five-Point Scales</i>		
1. Community members donate money for career development programs.	2.58	47%
2. Community members donate computer programs, written materials, etc.	2.98	68%
3. More students are taking higher level academic classes.	3.38	84%
4. More students are taking ATE classes.	3.58	87%
5. The district supports coordination among schools.	3.66	88%
Average Across All Program Components	4.05	91%
<i>Teacher Survey — Five-Point Scales</i>		
1. Teachers modify classroom activities based on the SEOP goals of students.	2.44	44%
2. Teachers receive an orientation to the career center.	2.60	49%
3. Teachers use career exploration resources in their classes.	2.85	61%
Average Across All Program Components	3.36	74%
		<i>Percent Agreeing</i>
<i>Counselor Survey — Yes or No</i>		
1. Community members help by donating money for career development activities.		16%
2. Samples of students' best academic work are considered when creating an SEOP.		18%
3. Samples of students' best academic work are kept in a portfolio.		19%
4. The number of students within each career area is charted.		21%
5. The SEOP process is evaluated by written evaluations from students in exit interviews.		23%
6. Students and counselors use computer programs to manage SEOP information.		28%
Average Across All Program Components		73%
<i>Teacher Survey — Yes or No</i>		
1. Students use their SEOP information in "my" class.		31%
2. I am involved as an instructor/advisor in the SEOP process.		48%
3. More class time has been devoted to guidance activities.		49%
Average Across All Program Components		60%



Table 3

**Program Successes: Main Categories of Responses to Open-Ended Question**

**What is the most significant success of the Comprehensive Guidance program in your school?**

	Responses in each Category	
	Number	Percent
<b>Teachers, N=434</b>		
<b>Student Planning.</b> Comprehensive Guidance helps students set career/life goals, create plans to meet those goals, and take classes related to their plans.	144	33%
<b>Extent of Services.</b> Every student meets with a guidance counselor (or advisor) and parent to design an SEOP.	106	24%
<b>Career Exploration.</b> Students are exposed to a wider range of career options at a younger age.	39	9%
<b>Principals, N = 156</b>		
<b>Student Planning.</b> Comprehensive Guidance helps students set career/life goals, create plans to meet those goals, and take classes related to their plans.	55	35%
<b>Extent of Services.</b> Every student meets with a guidance counselor (or advisor) and parent to design an SEOP.	50	32%
<b>Parental Involvement.</b> Parents are more involved in planning the education of their children.	41	26%
<b>Counselors, N = 176</b>		
<b>Extent of Services.</b> Counselors meet all students and are better able to respond to students' needs.	70	40%
<b>Program Coordination.</b> All school services and activities are more coordinated.	55	31%
<b>Student Planning.</b> Students are more involved in their education; their efforts are more focused and consistent.	51	29%

Table 4

**Obstacles to Successes: Main Categories of Responses to Open-Ended Question**

**What have been the greatest obstacles you have had to deal with in implementing Comprehensive Guidance at your school?**

	Responses in each Category	
	Number	Percent
<b>Teachers, N = 434</b>		
<b><u>Time Management.</u></b> There is not enough time to do everything that is required; the program requires too much busy work.	121	28%
<b><u>Lack of Teacher Preparation.</u></b> Teachers do not receive the training or information needed to get meaningfully involved in the program.	111	26%
<b><u>Counselor-to-Student Ratios.</u></b> Classes are too big and counselor-to-student ratios are too high for schools to provide individual guidance to all students.	33	8%
<b>Principals, N = 156</b>		
<b><u>Counselor-to-Student Ratios.</u></b> Counselor-to-student ratios are too high for schools to provide individual SEOP guidance and counseling services.	56	36%
<b><u>Time Management.</u></b> There is not enough time to do everything that is required; program requires too much busywork.	52	33%
<b><u>Clarity of Purpose.</u></b> Counselors and teachers have had a difficult time understanding the changes in roles and time allocation required.	32	21%
<b>Counselors, N = 176</b>		
<b><u>Time Management.</u></b> Too many demands on time without needed support; time consumed by SEOP hurts responsive services.	78	44%
<b><u>Resource Management.</u></b> Program funding does not get to schools; more funding is needed for support personnel and better facilities.	62	35%
<b><u>Teacher Support.</u></b> Teachers resent intrusions on class time; teaming with the entire faculty is difficult.	36	20%

Table 5

**Suggested Improvements: Main Categories of Responses to Open-Ended Question**

**What would help you most in your efforts to continue improving the guidance program at your school?**

	Responses in each Category	
	Number	Percent
<b>Teachers, N=434</b>		
<b><u>Teacher Preparation.</u></b> Teachers need to be better prepared to get involved in Comprehensive Guidance; provide inservice for <b>all</b> teachers.	143	33%
<b><u>Program Coordination.</u></b> Counselors need to get more teachers involved in using SEOP and career exploration information in <b>all</b> classes.	98	23%
<b><u>Administrative Support.</u></b> Administrators at the school and district levels need to schedule more time for teachers to get involved in the SEOP process.	55	13%
<b>Principals, N = 156</b>		
<b><u>Personnel Management.</u></b> Schools need more personnel to support program and free counselors to deal with responsive services and program promotion.	92	59%
<b><u>Funding.</u></b> Assure schools that funding will not disappear; increase budget flexibility and information; provide funding for lower grade levels.	46	29%
<b><u>Program Coordination.</u></b> Schools within the state and departments within schools need improved communication and coordination.	17	11%
<b>Counselors, N = 176</b>		
<b><u>Funding.</u></b> More funds are needed to pay for support personnel, additional counselors, summer planning, inservice, and support of lower grade-levels.	115	65%
<b><u>System Support.</u></b> Increase/maintain training for personnel at all school levels; increase district and administrative support for the program.	44	25%
<b><u>Time Management.</u></b> Schedule more time for counselors to receive/provide training, plan, fundraise, etc. by reducing data entry and SEOP duties.	28	16%

Table 6

**Job Satisfaction: Main Categories of Responses to Open-Ended Question**

How has Comprehensive Guidance affected your overall job satisfaction?
--

	Responses in each Category	
	Number	Percent
<b>Counselors, N = 176</b>		
<b><u>Improved job satisfaction</u></b> by allowing counselors to interact more actively with students, see results with all students, and spend more time counseling students.	48	27%
<b><u>Diminished job satisfaction</u></b> ; the program (especially the time demands of the SEOP process) has increased the <b>stress, frustration, and fatigue</b> that counselors experience in their jobs.	47	27%
<b><u>Improved job satisfaction</u></b> ; the job is more rewarding, more fulfilling, and more exciting.	41	23%
<b><u>Improved job satisfaction</u></b> by providing counselors with a more clear definition of their duties and increasing the professionalism of school counselors.	39	22%
<b><u>Diminished job satisfaction</u></b> by taking time away from responsive services; students have suffered from diminished responsive services.	18	10%
<b><u>Improved job satisfaction</u></b> ; the program has helped counselors use time more effectively, work harder, and increase their productivity.	13	7%

Table 7

**Job Performance: Main Categories of Responses to Open-Ended Question**

**Has the increased emphasis on teamwork affected the job performance of your counseling department?**

	Responses in each Category	
	Number	Percent
<b>Counselors, N = 176</b>		
<b><u>Increased Productivity.</u></b> Teamwork has helped the department use time more effectively through better planning and division of duties; departments are more productive.	53	30%
<b><u>Improved Unity.</u></b> Teaming has increased unity and communication within the entire faculty; it has also increased the visibility of counselors and allowed them to have more contact with students.	40	23%
<b><u>No Impact.</u></b> Teamwork has had no impact.	16	9%
<b><u>Enhanced Job Satisfaction.</u></b> Individual counselors are better able to focus on doing the things they enjoy and do well.	11	6%
<b><u>Reduced Stress.</u></b> Teamwork has helped counselors rely more on each other, thus alleviating some pressure.	10	6%

Table 8

**Unique Documents: Main Categories of Responses to Open-Ended Question**

**What especially unique documents or data do you have that support the Comprehensive Guidance program?**

	Responses in each Category	
	Number	Percent
<b>Counselors, N = 176</b>		
<b><u>Planning Forms.</u></b> The school or district has developed unique four- or five-year student planning forms, registration documents, or graduation checklists.	46	26%
<b><u>Portfolios.</u></b> The school or district has developed portfolios or student folders that follow students from grade to grade (predominantly grades 7-12).	26	15%
<b><u>Software.</u></b> The school or district has developed a computerized SEOP information management system.	11	6%
<b><u>Program Information.</u></b> The school or district has developed Comprehensive Guidance and/or SEOP pamphlets, brochures, videos, and/or orientation programs.	8	5%
<b><u>Surveys.</u></b> The school or district has developed parent and/or student surveys to identify school needs.	7	4%



**Table 9**

**Small Group SEOP Conferences: High Student Attendance**

<b>Percentage of Schools that Reported High Student Attendance <sup>1</sup></b>	
<b>GRADE LEVEL</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
7 <sup>th</sup>	74%
8 <sup>th</sup>	79%
9 <sup>th</sup>	80%
10 <sup>th</sup>	72%
11 <sup>th</sup>	70%
12 <sup>th</sup>	73%

**High Student Attendance** = at least 90% of students at the indicated grade level attended a small group SEOP conference during the 1996-7 school year.

**Table 10**

**Individual SEOP Conferences: An Increase in Student Attendance**

<b>Percentage of Schools that Reported <u>HIGH</u> Student Attendance <sup>1</sup></b>			
<b>GRADE LEVEL</b>	<b>1995-6</b>	<b>1996-7</b>	<b>Change in Percentage</b>
<b>7<sup>th</sup></b>	55%	64%	+9
<b>8<sup>th</sup></b>	63%	74%	+11
<b>9<sup>th</sup></b>	65%	74%	+9
<b>10<sup>th</sup></b>	56%	61%	+5
<b>11<sup>th</sup></b>	57%	66%	+9
<b>12<sup>th</sup></b>	71%	72%	+1

<b>Percentage of Schools that Reported <u>LOW</u> Student Attendance <sup>2</sup></b>			
<b>GRADE LEVEL</b>	<b>1995-6</b>	<b>1996-7</b>	<b>Change in Percentage</b>
<b>7<sup>th</sup></b>	36%	17%	-19
<b>8<sup>th</sup></b>	20%	7%	-13
<b>9<sup>th</sup></b>	20%	13%	-7
<b>10<sup>th</sup></b>	15%	14%	-1
<b>11<sup>th</sup></b>	17%	13%	-4
<b>12<sup>th</sup></b>	14%	14%	0

<sup>1</sup> **High Student Attendance** = at least 90% of students attended an individual SEOP conference

<sup>2</sup> **Low Student Attendance** = less than 70% of students attended an individual SEOP conference

Table 11

SEOP Conferences: An Increase in Parent Attendance

Percentage of Schools that Reported <u>HIGH</u> Parent Attendance <sup>1</sup>			
GRADE LEVEL	1995-6	1996-7	Change in Percentage
7 <sup>th</sup>	30%	35%	+5
8 <sup>th</sup>	34%	45%	+11
9 <sup>th</sup>	37%	51%	+14
10 <sup>th</sup>	38%	47%	+9
11 <sup>th</sup>	39%	43%	+4
12 <sup>th</sup>	36%	43%	+7

Percentage of Schools that Reported <u>LOW</u> Parent Attendance <sup>2</sup>			
GRADE LEVEL	1995-6	1996-7	Change in Percentage
7 <sup>th</sup>	40%	30%	-10
8 <sup>th</sup>	27%	17%	-10
9 <sup>th</sup>	30%	22%	-8
10 <sup>th</sup>	33%	26%	-7
11 <sup>th</sup>	33%	29%	-4
12 <sup>th</sup>	36%	33%	-3

<sup>1</sup> High Parent Attendance = at least 90% of parents attended an SEOP conference

<sup>2</sup> Low Parent Attendance = less than 70% of parents attended an SEOP conference

## Detailed Discussion of Combined Results

Taken separately, the results presented above provide a partial answer to the research question: How has Comprehensive Guidance been implemented across the state and how has that implementation impacted schools? When combined, the results provide a much more specific and detailed answer to the research question. Specifically, the results identified ten major program successes and nine areas for improvement. Strategies for continued program improvement also emerged from the data. Major program successes, areas for improvement, and strategies for continued improvement are presented in the following section: Detailed Discussion of Combined Results. Lastly, primary differences between high school and junior high/ middle school programs were identified.

### *Major Program Successes: Based on All Study Sources*

#### *Student Planning*

Statewide, Comprehensive Guidance has had a dramatic impact on student planning. Teachers, principals, and counselors consistently named student planning as one of the most significant successes of their Comprehensive Guidance programs. Survey data also indicated that several components of student planning are among the most widely implemented aspects of guidance and counseling in the state.

Teachers, principals, and counselors were asked the following question: What is the most significant success of the Comprehensive Guidance program at your school? Student planning was the most popular response among principals and teachers (35% and 33% of respondents respectively). Twenty-nine percent of responding counselors named student planning as the most significant success of their programs; it was the third most popular response. Some of the comments made most frequently about the effects of Comprehensive Guidance on student planning are listed below.

- Students are more involved in planning their education.
- Students' educational efforts (especially course taking) are more focused.
- Students' decision-making skills have improved.
- Students take advantage of more programs in school, especially school-to-careers and concurrent enrollment opportunities.
- More students are developing realistic post-secondary plans.

According to the survey data, several different aspects of student planning were among the most widely implemented program components in Utah's Comprehensive Guidance schools. In the vast majority of schools surveyed,

- all students select a career area,
- all students develop a formalized four- or five-year SEOP,

Counselors' efforts have impacted student attendance at small group and individual SEOP conferences. In the survey, counselors were asked to identify the percentage of students that attended a **small group** SEOP conference during the 1996-7 school year. At every grade level (7-12), at least 70% of the schools reported that 90% of their students attended a small group SEOP conference. See Table 9 (on page 16) for data on each grade level.

Counselors were also asked to identify the percentage of students that attended an individual SEOP conference in 1995-6 and the percentage that attended in 1996-7. For the purpose of this report, high student attendance was defined as at least 90% of students attending an individual SEOP conference. Low student attendance was identified as less than 70% of students attending an SEOP conference. **At every grade level, the percentage of schools reporting high student attendance increased from 1995-6 to 1996-7.** Also, at every grade level (except the 12<sup>th</sup> grade), the percentage of schools that reported low student attendance decreased. (See Table 10 on page 18 for grade level data.) Grades 7-9 experienced the most marked increase in student attendance.

### *Extent of Services*

**The extent of guidance and counseling services provided throughout the state has also been profoundly affected by the Comprehensive Guidance program.** Teachers, principals, and counselors all noted that Comprehensive Guidance has increased the interaction between counselors (including teachers acting as advisors or advocates) and students. This increased interaction has made schools more responsive to students' needs and better able to proactively identify students who may benefit from special services in school.

Forty percent of counselors identified the extent of services as the most significant program success. Thirty-two percent of principals and 24% of teachers identified extent of services as the most significant program success. The comments most frequently made about the impact of Comprehensive Guidance on the extent of student services are listed below.

- The program accounts for **all** students.
- Every student has individual contact with a counselor, advisor, or advocate.
- Special populations (e.g., students at risk of dropping out of school, ESL students) are identified and given the support they need.
- Student advocacy programs have become more effective.
- Teacher-student relationships have improved; teachers are more aware of the whole student.
- Counselors provide more direct services to students.

Counselors also noted that Comprehensive Guidance has positively affected their job satisfaction because it has allowed them to **counsel more students** (see Table 6 on page 13). Job satisfaction has increased as counselors have become more actively involved with students and seen results with a much broader range of students (not just college bound or at-risk students).

Several survey items related to extent of services were among the most widely implemented program components across the state. These items are listed below.

- 97% of the schools reported that **all students, including special populations, receive equal treatment in the SEOP process**
- 99% of the schools reported that **special population students are included in relevant career exploration activities**
- 97% of the schools reported that **all students meet individually with a counselor every year**

### *Program Coordination*

**The Comprehensive Guidance program has improved teamwork and coordination within schools.** In some instances, Comprehensive Guidance has provided a management system or unifying vision and purpose for the entire school. Teachers, administrators, and counselors have begun working together for the overriding purpose of preparing students to succeed beyond high school.

Counselors and principals named program coordination as one of the most significant benefits of Comprehensive Guidance (see Table 3, page 10). Specific comments on how Comprehensive Guidance affected program coordination are listed below.

- Administrators have become more involved in working with all faculty members.
- Administrators have become more supportive of counseling and guidance efforts.
- Teachers have become more supportive of and involved in guidance activities.
- Curriculum and course offerings have become more flexible to meet student needs.
- Counseling efforts are now driven by planning and a systemic approach.
- Comprehensive guidance provides an organizing center for the whole school.

Counselors also responded to a question about the effects of teamwork on job performance. Twenty-three percent of counselors remarked that teamwork had a) increased the unity of the faculty, b) improved communication within the counseling department, and c) made counselors more visible in the school.

One survey item related to program coordination was among the most widely implemented program components: The administration receives information about changes made to the SEOP process and products. Another program coordination item was among the most widely implemented program components in middle/junior high schools: All school personnel know about all scheduled SEOP activities several weeks in advance.



### *Parental Involvement*

**Because of the Comprehensive Guidance program, parents have become more involved in schools.** Schools have increased parental involvement by making concerted efforts to inform parents about school programs (especially the SEOP process) and actively scheduling SEOP conferences with parents.

Principals and teachers identified parental involvement as one of the most significant successes of their programs. Specific comments on how Comprehensive Guidance had affected parental involvement are listed below.

- Relationships between parents and the school have improved.
- Parents have become more involved in all aspects of the school.
- Schools have received more praise from parents.
- Parents' perceptions about the purpose of school have changed.

Three survey items related to parental involvement were among the most widely implemented program components.

- At 99% of schools, parents are informed about the purpose of the SEOP process (beyond registration) in the SEOP conference.
- At 98% of schools, the school actively scheduled SEOP conferences with parents.
- At 98% of the schools, parents supported the SEOP process.

**These efforts increased parent attendance at SEOP conferences.** In the survey, counselors were asked to record the percentage of parents that attended an SEOP conference at each grade level for two academic years, 1995-6 and 1996-7. The percentage of schools that reported at least 90% parent attendance increased from one year to the next at every grade level (see Table 11, page 18). The percentage of schools that reported less than 70% parent attendance decreased from one year to the next at every grade level.

### *Policy and Job Definition*

**The statewide expansion of Comprehensive Guidance has clarified what counselors are expected to do in school.** The clear definitions of duties have given counselors more direction and helped them eliminate non-guidance activities from their workload. Comprehensive Guidance training and SEOP policies have helped administrators perceive counselors as **counselors** rather than registration clerks and support staff. When asked how Comprehensive Guidance had affected their job satisfaction, 22% of counselors remarked that it had increased the professionalism of counselors by clearly defining their responsibilities, balancing their workload, and holding them accountable.

**Comprehensive Guidance has given more direction to the SEOP process.** According to survey data, four of the most widely implemented program components are related to the creation and implementation of SEOP policy.

- At 95% of schools, an SEOP policy, based on district policy, had been created.
- At 100% of schools, SEOP conferences were conducted according to school and district policy.
- At 99% of schools, principals made certain that counselors implemented district policy and state law on the SEOP process.
- At 99% of schools, principals held counselors responsible for following SEOP policy.

### *Departmental Productivity*

**Comprehensive Guidance has increased the productivity of counselors.** According to the counselor survey,

- 100% of counselors had acquired the skills to implement a successful guidance program,
- 99% of counselors had received training on the SEOP process, and
- 98% of counselors had learned the skills needed to carry out their SEOP responsibilities.

Well-trained counselors have also benefited from an emphasis on teamwork. When asked how the emphasis on teamwork has affected their job performance, 30% of counselors noted that it had increased their productivity through better goal setting, improved planning, and more effective use of time.

Participation in Comprehensive Guidance has also led many counselors to produce unique documents that have improved efficiency. In the survey, counseling departments were asked the following question: What unique documents or data do you have that support the Comprehensive Guidance program? Seventeen counseling departments responded that they had created planning calendars and/or task analysis documents to better manage their time. Table 8 (page 15) contains more information on responses to the preceding question.

Comprehensive Guidance has also provided schools with an additional funding source to support their guidance efforts. This funding has allowed some schools to improve their career exploration resources and hire more personnel (counselors and/or support staff). Ninety-seven percent of counselors noted that career exploration materials in their schools cover a wide range of career choices. Improved funding was one of the main successes of Comprehensive Guidance, according to counselors.

### *Career Exploration*

**The Comprehensive Guidance program has helped expose students to a wider range of career options at a younger age.** This was one of the major program benefits mentioned by teachers (see Table 3, page 10). Career exploration has also been widely emphasized by Comprehensive Guidance schools. Several survey items related to career exploration were among the most widely implemented program components; these items are listed below.

- 99% of schools reported that **all students were exposed<sup>d</sup> to a wide range of career options**
- 96% of schools reported that **community members supported the SEOP process by providing personnel for career fairs, etc.**
- 94% of schools reported that **career days, job shadowing, field trip, etc. covered a wide range of career options**
- 93% of schools reported that **career fairs, etc. were of high quality and provide up-to-date, hands-on information to students**

### *Information Management*

As they have implemented Comprehensive Guidance programs in their schools, counselors have developed new ways to efficiently manage student information. Forty-six schools have developed unique planning forms, registration documents, and/or graduation checklists that have helped them provide more support to students. Twenty-six schools have created student portfolios that have improved coordination between school levels. Table 8 (page 15) provides more information about unique documents created by schools.

These documents and other processes have helped counselors become more aware of trends in students' SEOP goals and career interests. Ninety-eight percent of counselors reported that the following statement applied to their programs: Counselors and teachers who act as advisors are aware of trends in the SEOP goals and interests of students.

### *Clarity of Purpose*

Comprehensive Guidance has helped counselors define and communicate the main goals of their guidance programs. Ninety-nine percent of counselors noted that the SEOP process is clearly labeled by name and explained to parents and that parents are informed about the purpose of the SEOP process beyond mere registration. Also, four of the most widely implemented program components, according to teacher survey data, were related to clarity of purpose. These items are listed below.

- The administration ensures that school SEOP goals are created and supported.
- Teachers receive memos about SEOP activities.
- Teachers support goals related to the SEOP process.
- Teachers are familiar with the SEOP processes at their schools.

### *Guidance Curriculum*

Counselors mentioned improved guidance curriculum as one of the major benefits of Comprehensive Guidance. (See Table 3, page 10.) The Comprehensive Guidance program promotes three types of direct services that counselors should deliver: student planning, responsive services, and

guidance curriculum. While not as widely implemented as many aspects of student planning, guidance curriculum has been positively affected by the Comprehensive Guidance program.

Specifically, classroom presentations by counselors have increased counselor-student interaction. The issues addressed in such presentations have prompted students to identify their needs and take advantage of responsive services.

One survey item dealing with guidance curriculum was among the most widely implemented program components (for junior high/middle schools): Guidance curriculum is integrated with existing classes.

### *Major Areas for Improvement: Based on All Study Sources*

#### *Time Management*

Counselors, principals, and teachers all identified time management as a major obstacle to implementing successful Comprehensive Guidance programs. Comprehensive Guidance changed the way that most counselors traditionally allocated their time. The program strongly emphasizes direct services, especially in the area of student planning, and de-emphasizes non-guidance activities such as system support. Comprehensive Guidance also instituted formal oversight procedures that require counselors to create planning calendars, document their allocation of time, etc. These procedures, in addition to the proliferation of student planning documents, have placed new, time-consuming burdens on schools. Teachers and principals focused on the following issues.

- The program requires too much "busywork."
- Achievement-driven education leaves no class time for meaningful career education.
- Teachers are asked to give up too much class time.
- There is no time to train or involve teachers.

Counselors took a slightly different slant. They believed that the SEOP process, non-guidance activities, and oversight requirements demanded too much time for counselors to effectively deal with other issues. According to counselors, too many demands have been made without providing the additional support needed to meet those demands.

Twenty-eight counseling departments (16% of respondents) further illuminated this issue by suggesting ways to improve time management.

- Increase the time counselors can spend training, fundraising, and planning.
- Decrease the time required by the SEOP process; allow more time for responsive services.
- Decrease the data entry duties of counselors.

When asked how Comprehensive Guidance had affected their job satisfaction, forty-seven counseling departments (27% of respondents) commented that it had increased the stress, frustration, and fatigue

that they experience. Most of these counselors singled out time demands of the SEOP process as the culprit. In the same vein, eighteen counseling departments (10%) stated that their job satisfaction has decreased because time has been taken away from responsive services; they believed that the decrease in responsive services negatively affected students.

Concerns about the increasing amount of time required by the SEOP process and the decreasing amount of time available for responsive services also appeared in the multiple-choice survey results. Two of the least widely implemented program components dealt with time allocation.

- 36% of the schools reported that the amount of time dedicated to responsive services had decreased over the past several years
- 44% of the schools reported that the time needed to manage the SEOP process infringed on the responsive services provided

### *Funding*

Comprehensive Guidance has made more funds available to schools that have qualified for the program. However, the flow of funds and lack of budget information have frustrated school-level personnel.

Principals and counselors both identified funding as a primary obstacle to successful implementation of Comprehensive Guidance in their schools. Principals believed that the main funding dilemma was lack of district and state support in getting available funds into the schools. They remarked that schools need to have a) more input on budget matters, b) more guidance on how to acquire funds, and c) more technological support.

According to counselors, the flow of funds (especially into middle schools) was a major problem. Counselors specified that they needed the funds to a) improve career centers, b) update technology, c) hire support personnel, and d) pay for summer planning sessions.

Twenty-nine percent of responding principals stated that the Comprehensive Guidance program would improve if schools could be assured that neither Comprehensive Guidance nor its funding would disappear in the near future. Sixty-five percent of counselors reported that improved funding was the main program need.

One survey item regarding funding was among the lowest rated items on the counselor survey. Twenty-nine percent of schools reported that their district office does **not** solicit input about program budget needs.

### *Personnel Management*

The funding made available by Comprehensive Guidance enabled some schools to hire a new counselor or pay for additional clerical support. Yet, counselor-to-student ratios are still too low for many schools to fully implement their programs.

According to principals, lack of personnel is the main obstacle to program success. Thirty three percent of responding principals observed that their schools had too many students to provide



individual SEOP assistance in addition to **counseling** services. Below, some of the comments made most frequently about personnel issues are listed.

- Counselors are overburdened and in jeopardy of burnout.
- Schools lack enough qualified personnel to provide individual services to all students.
- Personnel turnover completely disrupts the program.

Principals also asserted that an increase in trained personnel would be the best way to improve the Comprehensive Guidance program in their schools. Ninety-two principals (59% of respondents) believed that one or more of the following things would greatly benefit their programs: a) an additional counselor, b) more support personnel, or c) more inclusive training of current personnel.

### *Program Support*

**The new demands that Comprehensive Guidance has placed on schools exceed the additional support that schools have received from USOE and their district offices.** Teachers, principals, and counselors agreed that state and district policies must be altered to create work schedules and job descriptions that make the program more feasible and demonstrate the program's importance.

Fifty-five teachers (13%) believed that school-level and district administrators needed to schedule more time for teachers to get meaningfully involved in the program. Specific suggestions appear below.

- Show teachers the importance of the program by adjusting their workloads, rather than asking them to help on the side.
- Enable teachers to have more individual contact with the students they advise.
- Train administrators to get the vision of how teachers can get involved in the program.

Moreover, 45% of teachers reported that they were not given enough time for their SEOP responsibilities.

Principals focused on a slightly different aspect of program support. They stated that schools need more direction in how to implement Comprehensive Guidance with less resistance. They specifically requested more statewide publicity on the program and more support in informing parents and community members about Comprehensive Guidance and the SEOP process. Principals also expressed a need for more direction in how to use teachers in guidance activities and more information about what works in other schools.

Twenty-five percent of the responding counseling departments asserted that their program would be best served by increased administrative, district, and state support. These counselors frequently specified that more training should be provided for all school personnel at all levels.

Several of the least widely implemented components of Comprehensive Guidance relate to district and administrative support. Survey results indicated that districts could improve the support they provide to guidance programs by:

- modifying programs, course offerings, etc. to meet student needs,
- soliciting input about budget needs, and
- supporting coordination (both vertical and horizontal) among schools.

School-level administrations can improve their support by a) requiring **all** teachers to receive inservice on the SEOP process and b) reserving time in faculty meetings to address Comprehensive Guidance issues.

### *Program Coordination*

As stated in the section on major program successes, **Comprehensive Guidance has improved teamwork and coordination within schools. However, there is still significant room for improvement.**

Twenty-three percent of teachers and 11% of principals believed that increased interaction and coordination among the entire faculty would do the most to improve the Comprehensive Guidance programs at their schools. The teachers averred that counselors need to help teachers implement guidance activities and SEOP information in **all** classes. Some of their specific suggestions for improvement are listed below.

- Involve more teachers in the program.
- Provide all teachers with lesson plans and career exploration ideas for all subject areas.
- Increase the visibility of the SEOP in the school.
- Help teachers use SEOP information in their classes.

According to the teacher survey, one of the least widely implemented program components relates to program coordination. Only 49% of the responding teachers reported that more class time has been devoted to guidance activities as a result of the Comprehensive Guidance program.

Principals commented more about the need for improved coordination between schools that are in the same feeder system. They also suggested that more teachers needed to be involved in SEOP committees and budgeting decisions.

Counselors noted the same obstacles, but assigned more responsibility for improvements to teachers and principals. Thirty-six counseling departments identified poor coordination with teachers as a major obstacle to program success. Some of their specific comments are listed below.

- Teachers resent intrusions into their classrooms and on their time.
- Counselors have very little access to classrooms.
- Teaming with faculty members outside the counseling department is difficult.



### *Teacher Preparation*

Many Comprehensive Guidance schools have struggled to find the best way to involve teachers in the SEOP process and delivery of guidance curriculum. Some schools rely heavily on assistance from teachers, while others have their counseling departments carry out the majority of the SEOP and guidance curriculum duties. Forty-eight percent of the surveyed teachers were involved as advisors or instructors in the SEOP process.

Regardless of how teachers are employed in the guidance program, they can be better prepared for their involvement. Teachers listed their lack of preparation as the second most prominent obstacle to the success of Comprehensive Guidance in their schools. These teachers (26% of the respondents) made the following statements.

- Teachers do not receive the training or information they need to get truly involved in the program.
- Teachers lack access to SEOP and guidance information.
- Teachers are unaware of and unprepared for guidance activities.

Likewise, when asked what would help them most improve the guidance programs in their schools, 33% of teachers stated that teachers need to know more about the purpose of Comprehensive Guidance and the ways in which they can get involved. Some of their specific suggestions appear below.

- Provide inservice (including “guidance” training) to all teachers.
- Improve the information provided to teachers about the program (do not rely solely on memos).
- Update the faculty on program progress.
- Improve the consistency of purpose between counselors and administrators.

Among Comprehensive Guidance schools, only 66% of the administrations required inservice on the SEOP process. Consequently, only 62% of teachers reported that they had learned the skills needed to carry out their SEOP responsibilities.

### *Use of SEOP information*

Many schools also face another difficulty: how to effectively use SEOP information outside of SEOP conferences. Several of the least widely implemented program components (provided in Table 2, page 9) relate to the use of students' SEOP information.

Students do not frequently use their SEOP information outside of the SEOP conference.

- 69% of teachers noted that students did not use SEOP information in their class

- 56% of teachers did not modify classroom activities based on the SEOP goals/interests of students

Counselors agreed that in many schools students do **not** use their SEOP information in the following ways: a) in academic or ATE classes, b) with a counselor outside of the conference, or c) on their own.

In addition, many schools can improve the ways in which they manage students' SEOP information. At 98% of the schools, counselors and teachers who act as advisors were aware of trends in the SEOP goals and interests of students. However,

- only 21% of the schools charted the number or percentage of students within each career area, and
- only 28% used computer programs to manage students' SEOP information.

### *Use of Career Exploration Resources*

While the funding made available through Comprehensive Guidance has helped many schools improve the career exploration resources available in their schools, access to those resources is sometimes limited. **Many programs can improve the ways in which teachers and students use career exploration resources.**

When asked how the guidance program in their school could be most improved, 11% of teachers suggested the following types of improvements.

- Increase access to career guidance facilities and resources.
- Expand the subject matter relevance of guidance materials.
- Increase teacher familiarity with the career center.

At approximately half of the schools surveyed, teachers do **not** receive an orientation to the career center. Only 66% of the schools provided all students with a formal orientation to the career center. Consequently, students and teacher do not take full advantage of the resources available at many schools.

- At 43% of the schools, students do **not** use the career center outside of regular classes.
- At 39% of schools, teachers do **not** use career exploration resources in their classes.

### *Community Involvement*

Most Comprehensive Guidance schools have succeeded in getting community groups to provide personnel for career fairs, field trips, job shadowing and other career exploration activities. However, most schools have not been able to get community groups to donate money, computer programs, materials, etc. for their guidance programs. In light of the funding obstacles that many schools face, such contributions are extremely important to the continued growth and improvement of the Comprehensive Guidance program statewide.

### *Strategies for Continued Success*

In the previous section, several strategies for improvement and continued success were presented. Those strategies were suggested by survey participants in response to open-ended questions. Another set of strategies emerged from the multiple-choice survey items. The following strategies were identified by reviewing which program components were most closely linked to desired outcomes.

#### *Parental Involvement*

Schools that reported high levels of parent attendance at SEOP conferences also reported: a) high levels of district support, b) active involvement in the SEOP process by the principal, and c) high quality career exploration activities.

The following types of district support apparently had the greatest impact on parental involvement: a) modifying programs, course offerings, and curriculum to meet student needs; b) developing guidance curriculum; and c) developing SEOP documentation and career planning forms.

Schools that reported high parent attendance were also more likely to report that their programs received sufficient funding, their counselors had received the training needed to perform effectively, and their SEOP processes did not infringe on the responsive services provided.

#### *Use of the Career Center*

Increased student use of the career center is linked to several program components as well. Many of these are obvious. Some ways to increase student use of the career center are listed below.

- Provide teachers with an orientation to the career center.
- Make sure that teachers know about and have access to products which support the SEOP process (e.g., registration and goal setting forms, CHOICES printouts, curriculum materials).
- Post work-based and scholarship information in the career center.
- Have students use their SEOP information in all guidance activities.
- Change course offerings in response to trends in students' SEOP goals.

In sum, students are more likely to use the career center when their teachers are more familiar with career exploration resources and when schools emphasize the importance of SEOP information.

#### *Student Interest in the SEOP Process*

The activities listed in the preceding section (Use of the Career Center) are also related to increased student interest in the SEOP process. In addition, student interest increases when a) coordination within the feeder system on the SEOP process increases, and b) students access their SEOP information with their parents outside the SEOP conference.

### *Course Taking*

An effective SEOP process should lead more students to take classes that are consistent with their identified career goals. It should also prompt more students to take higher level academic classes and take advantage of ATE courses.

The survey data suggests that more students took classes consistent with their SEOP when:

- Parents knew beforehand what would be expected of them in the SEOP conference.
- Teachers understood their roles in the SEOP process.
- All school personnel knew about scheduled SEOP activities several weeks in advance.
- Course offerings changed in response to students' SEOP goals.
- SEOP products were received from and shared with schools in the feeder system.

More students took higher level academic courses when a) students used the career center outside of regular classes, b) scholarship information was posted in the career center, and c) students frequently used their SEOP information outside of the SEOP conference.

More students took ATE classes when:

- Teachers had access to the career goals of their students.
- Schools within the feeder system coordinated SEOP processes and guidance curriculum.
- Students were introduced to STC activities related to their career interests.
- Student portfolios included information about students' hobbies and school activities.
- Career related field trips were provided.

### *Post-Secondary Plans*

An effective SEOP process should prompt more students to plan post-secondary training or education. The survey results indicated that more students developed post-secondary plans when:

- Students used the career center more frequently.
- Scholarship information was posted in the career center.
- Students at risk of dropping out of school were proactively identified and given additional support in the SEOP process.
- Students' portfolios included results from aptitude tests, interest inventories, achievement tests, and college entrance exam scores.
- A post-high school orientation program was offered.

## Conclusions

Statewide, the growth and development of Comprehensive Guidance has had a major impact on the SEOP process and other indicators in Utah public schools. However, some aspects of the program continue to present problems to many schools. To overcome the obstacles and more fully implement the Comprehensive Guidance program, these schools will need additional support from school-level, district, and state administrations.

Comprehensive Guidance has had the greatest impact on student planning, the extent of counseling and guidance services offered in schools, and the level of coordination within schools. More students at all grade levels are attending SEOP conferences and actively planning their educational and occupational development. Also, more students are receiving individual attention from school counselors and advisors. This process has helped schools better identify students with special needs and provide them with the services they need to stay in school. In terms of school-wide coordination, Comprehensive Guidance provides an organizing center for administrators, teachers, and counselors to coordinate their efforts.

The Comprehensive Guidance program has also had a positive influence on parental involvement in school, the productivity and professionalism of counselors, career exploration, the management of student information, and the delivery of guidance curriculum. Consequently, parents and students are taking advantage more often of the many services and programs that schools offer.

Comprehensive Guidance requires schools to alter their traditional perception of the counselor's role; it also requires counselors to adjust their allocation of time to different tasks. In many schools, teachers and counselors continue to view Comprehensive Guidance as a program for counselors rather than a school-wide program. Without sufficient administrative and teacher support, counseling departments do not have enough time to meet all the objectives of their guidance programs.

Funding also continues to pose a problem to many schools. These schools have been frustrated by the ineffective flow of funds through districts and the lack of information about funding and budget issues. At many schools, counselors, teachers, and principals believe that counselor-to-students ratios are too low and that not enough support personnel exist.

Finally, preparing teachers to get meaningfully involved in the Comprehensive Guidance program has been difficult. There is not enough time or money to provide adequate inservice to all teachers.

Many of the obstacles that schools face can be overcome in the schools themselves. However, schools could use support from districts and the state in learning how to manage time and resources more effectively. Networking and training opportunities that focus on time and resource management will support counselors in the areas they need it most. The Comprehensive Guidance program would also benefit from an effort to adjust teachers' and counselors' work schedules to enable them to carry out their SEOP responsibilities more effectively without infringing on their other duties.



## **APPENDIX A**

### **COMPREHENSIVE GUIDANCE PROGRAM**

#### **COUNSELOR SURVEY**





## COUNSELOR SURVEY

### Directions:

The counselor **team** at your school should respond **as a group** to the items in this survey. Use the accompanying **answer sheet** to report how the Comprehensive Guidance Program has been implemented at your school. As you read the following statements in the left-hand column, use the scale provided in the right-hand column to **determine** your responses. On the answer sheet provided, mark the appropriate response. Make sure your **answer sheet** has "Counselor Survey Response Form" printed in the top margin of Side Two. If an item does not apply to the grade levels at your school or you do not have the information needed to respond accurately, leave that item blank. **YOUR RESPONSES TO THIS SURVEY WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL.**

### Examples:

4. The PTA helps contact and inform parents about the SEOP process.

A B C D E  
4 ○ ○ ○ ○ ●

In this case, the respondent marked "E," meaning that the Comprehensive Guidance Program at the school does not use the PTA to help contact parents about the SEOP process, including SEOP conferences.

5. Teachers know about and have access to products which support the SEOP process (e.g., registration and goal setting forms, CHOICES printouts, curriculum materials).

A B C D E  
5 ○ ● ○ ○ ○ ○

In this case, the respondent has marked "B." This response indicates that MOST teachers at the school know about and have access to SEOP products.

Use the following scale to indicate how accurately the statements of the left-hand column describe your program.

A B C D E  
4 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

### THE STATEMENT IS:

- A. **EXTREMELY ACCURATE**
- B. **VERY ACCURATE**
- C. **REASONABLY ACCURATE**
- D. **NOT VERY ACCURATE**
- E. **NOT AT ALL ACCURATE**

## COUNSELOR SURVEY

**CLARITY OF PURPOSE**—The Comprehensive Guidance Program has clearly identified and communicated the goals and expected outcomes of its SEOP process.

1. All teachers receive **memos** about SEOP activities.
2. All teachers receive **inservice** or **training** on the SEOP process.
3. Information about the SEOP process is presented to parents at school meetings (e.g., PTA, Orientation, Back-to-School Night).
4. The PTA helps contact and inform parents about the SEOP process.
5. Teachers know about and have access to products which support the SEOP process (e.g., registration and goal setting forms, CHOICES printouts, curriculum materials).
6. Parents know beforehand what will be expected of them in the SEOP conference.
7. Parents are supportive of the SEOP process.
8. Teachers understand their roles in the SEOP process.
9. Teachers support counselor efforts to achieve SEOP goals.
10. The administration receives information about all changes made to the SEOP process and products.
11. All school personnel (both administration and teachers) know about all scheduled SEOP activities several weeks in advance.
12. SEOP conferences are conducted according to school and district policy.

Use the following scale to indicate how accurately the statements of the left-hand column describe your program.

A B C D E  
1 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

**THE STATEMENT IS:**

A. **EXTREMELY ACCURATE**

B. **VERY ACCURATE**

C. **REASONABLY ACCURATE**

D. **NOT VERY ACCURATE**

E. **NOT AT ALL ACCURATE**

---

**The school administration:**

13. Organizes **special faculty meetings** on the SEOP process.
14. Requires **inservice** on the SEOP process.
15. Creates and supports **school goals** related to SEOP.
16. Participates in an **active role** in the SEOP process.

## COUNSELOR SURVEY

**PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**—Parents, community organizations, and businesses are actively involved in all stages of the SEOP process and are kept informed of SEOP goals, activities, and products.

17. The school actively schedules SEOP conferences with parents, making phone calls and scheduling night time conferences when necessary.
18. Parents receive SEOP products (graduation requirements, CHOICES printouts, students' previous goals) **prior** to the SEOP conference.
19. Parents and students are informed about career exploration activities and programs **in a variety of ways** (e.g., school marquees, letters mailed directly to parents, telephone calling networks).

**RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**—Resources, including information, personnel, hardware and software, are efficiently employed and made accessible to all students.

20. The SEOP process is clearly **labeled by name** and explained to parents in the SEOP conference.
21. Parents are informed about the purpose of the SEOP process (beyond course registration) in the conference.
22. Teachers are carefully selected and trained when used as advisors in the SEOP process.
23. Teachers have access to the career goals of their students.
24. Most teachers include career guidance activities as part of their curriculum.
25. Teachers receive an orientation to the career center.
26. All students visit the career center at least once during the year.
27. Career fairs, job shadowing, guest speakers, etc., are of high quality and provide up-to-date, hands-on information to students.
28. Counselors and teachers who act as advisors are aware of trends in the SEOP goals and interests of students.
29. Course offerings change in response to trends in students' SEOP goals.

Use the following scale to indicate how accurately the statements of the left-hand column describe your program.

A B C D E  
17 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

**THE STATEMENT IS:**

A. **EXTREMELY ACCURATE**

B. **VERY ACCURATE**

C. **REASONABLY ACCURATE**

D. **NOT VERY ACCURATE**

E. **NOT AT ALL ACCURATE**

## COUNSELOR SURVEY

30. Counselors **receive** and **use** information about the SEOP goals and interests of students entering their school (e.g., the freshman class, in-state transfer students).
31. Career days, job fairs, job shadowing, field trips, etc., cover a wide range of career choices.
32. Sufficient time and personnel are set aside to meet the requirements of the SEOP process.
33. In our school, the time needed to manage the SEOP process **does not infringe** on the responsive services provided.
34. As a counseling team, the training we received on the Comprehensive Guidance Program has enabled us to perform more effectively.
35. All counselors in our school have acquired the skills needed to implement a highly successful Comprehensive Guidance Program.
36. Our counseling department receives sufficient funding to implement a highly successful Comprehensive Guidance Program.

---

### Career center characteristics:

37. Career guidance software programs (e.g., CHOICES) are accessible throughout the school: in regular classrooms, writing and computer labs, the career center, and counselors' offices.
38. Work-based information is posted (e.g., job placement, internships, job shadowing, career fairs).
39. Scholarship information is posted (e.g., contests, summer educational opportunities, extracurricular activities).
40. The center can accommodate the number of students in a typical class.
41. **All** students receive a formal orientation to the center.
42. Students frequently use the center before, during, and after school (outside of regular classes).

Use the following scale to indicate how accurately the statements of the left-hand column describe your program.

A B C D E  
30 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

### THE STATEMENT IS:

- A. **EXTREMELY ACCURATE**
- B. **VERY ACCURATE**
- C. **REASONABLY ACCURATE**
- D. **NOT VERY ACCURATE**
- E. **NOT AT ALL ACCURATE**

## COUNSELOR SURVEY

### As a result of the Comprehensive Guidance Program:

- 43. More students use the career center more frequently.
- 44. More class time has been devoted to guidance activities.
- 45. More counselor time and resources have been devoted to SEOP activities.

### Resources (e.g., videos, computer software, print material) used to introduce students to career choices:

- 46. Are readily available.
- 47. Cover a wide range of career choices.
- 48. Are of high quality and provide up-to-date information.

### Students typically use their SEOP information or portfolios:

- 49. During meetings (other than SEOP conferences) with advisors or counselors.
- 50. During guidance activities other than the SEOP conference.
- 51. During both academic and Applied Technology Education classes.
- 52. When working in the career center.
- 53. When results from aptitude tests are presented.
- 54. When results from achievement tests are presented.
- 55. Frequently on their own.

**PROGRAM COORDINATION**—The Comprehensive Guidance Program coordinates its processes and products with schools within its feeder system and works cooperatively with overlapping programs within the school.

- 56. Guidance curriculum activities provide orientation to SEOP conferences.
- 57. Guidance curriculum is integrated with existing classes.
- 58. SEOP products for all students are received from and shared with schools within our feeder system (junior high or middle schools, post-secondary institutions, Applied Technology Centers, etc.).

Use the following scale to indicate how accurately the statements of the left-hand column describe your program.

A B C D E

43 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

### THE STATEMENT IS:

A. **EXTREMELY ACCURATE**

B. **VERY ACCURATE**

C. **REASONABLY ACCURATE**

D. **NOT VERY ACCURATE**

E. **NOT AT ALL ACCURATE**

## COUNSELOR SURVEY

59. The SEOP process and products are jointly developed with representatives within our feeder system.
60. The guidance curriculum has been jointly designed with representatives within our feeder system.
61. Teachers and counselors jointly plan guidance curriculum to make it relevant to ongoing activities in the classroom.
62. Counselors regularly work with the school-to-careers coordinators at the school or district level to coordinate their efforts and activities.
63. Guidance activities have been coordinated with guidance activities at schools within our feeder system.

**EXTENT OF SERVICES**—All students receive support in assessing their interests and abilities, surveying their education and occupation options, and developing plans to meet their goals.

**NOTE:** *Special populations include students at risk of dropping out of school, resource students, students with disabilities, students who speak English as a second language, learning disabled students, etc.*

64. **All students**, including the special populations, receive equal treatment in the SEOP process.
65. Special efforts are made to contact the parents of students at risk of dropping out of school to encourage those parents to attend SEOP conferences.
66. Appropriate accommodations (e.g., translators) are made for special-population students when they take interest inventories and aptitude tests.
67. Students at risk of dropping out of school are identified in a proactive manner and given additional support in the SEOP process.
68. Special-population students are included in career exploration activities relevant to their abilities and goals.
69. Guest speakers from diverse demographic backgrounds are invited to make presentations to all students.
70. Counselors coordinate activities with personnel who work with members of the special populations.
71. Students who plan to attend post-secondary institutions receive support in the following ways: applying for appropriate exams, obtaining admissions applications, and submitting relevant financial aid forms.

Use the following scale to indicate how accurately the statements of the left-hand column describe your program.

A B C D E  
59 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

**THE STATEMENT IS:**

- A. **EXTREMELY ACCURATE**
- B. **VERY ACCURATE**
- C. **REASONABLY ACCURATE**
- D. **NOT VERY ACCURATE**
- E. **NOT AT ALL ACCURATE**



## COUNSELOR SURVEY

**STUDENT PLANNING**—Students create specific education and occupation plans designed to help them attain their stated goals.

- 72. Students are exposed to a wide range of career options as part of the guidance curriculum and SEOP conference.
- 73. Students are exposed to a wide range of school-to-careers opportunities as part of the SEOP process.
- 74. Students are introduced to school-to-careers activities (e.g., registered apprenticeships, tech prep, academy programs, internships) that are related to their career goals.
- 75. There is a mechanism in place in our SEOP process to assure that students' schedules are consistent with their selected career goals.

Use the following scale to indicate how accurately the statements of the left-hand column describe your program.

A B C D E

72 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

**THE STATEMENT IS:**

A. **EXTREMELY  
ACCURATE**

B. **VERY ACCURATE**

C. **REASONABLY  
ACCURATE**

D. **NOT VERY  
ACCURATE**

E. **NOT AT ALL  
ACCURATE**

**NOTE:** The scale in the right-hand column will change on the following page.

## COUNSELOR SURVEY

**PROGRAM COORDINATION**—The Comprehensive Guidance Program coordinates its processes and products with schools within its feeder system and works cooperatively with overlapping programs within the school.

**Rate the extent of DISTRICT-LEVEL SUPPORT for the SEOP process and products in the following areas:**

76. Development of guidance curriculum.
77. SEOP documentation and career planning forms.
78. Career assessment (e.g., aptitude tests, interest inventories, assessments of learning styles).
79. Inservice assistance.
80. Coordination (both vertical and horizontal) among schools.
81. Joint planning.
82. Soliciting input about **budget needs**.
83. Modifying programs, course offerings, and curriculum to meet student needs.
84. Providing an explanation on how to implement the district policy for the SEOP process.
85. **Accountability**—the district follows up and encourages schools to complete Comprehensive Guidance Program requirements.
86. **Supplying resources** needed to successfully implement the SEOP process.
87. Providing **leadership** on implementation of the Comprehensive Guidance Program.

Use the following scale to rate district-level support for the areas described in the statements of the left-hand column.

A B C D E  
76 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

**A. EXTENSIVE  
SUPPORT**

**B. MORE THAN  
ADEQUATE  
SUPPORT**

**C. ADEQUATE  
SUPPORT**

**D. SOMEWHAT  
LIMITED  
SUPPORT**

**E. VERY LIMITED  
SUPPORT**

**NOTE:** The scale in the right-hand column will change on the following page.

## COUNSELOR SURVEY

Over the past several years:

- 88. The percentage of parents involved in the SEOP process has ...
- 89. Community involvement in the SEOP process has ...
- 90. Student interest in the SEOP process has ...
- 91. The extent of district-level support has ...
- 92. The amount of counselor time devoted to working directly with students has ...
- 93. The amount of time dedicated to responsive services has ...
- 94. The level of coordination within our feeder system on the SEOP process has ...

Use the following scale to complete the statements in the left-hand column.

A B C D E

88 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

A. INCREASED  
DRAMATICALLY

B. INCREASED  
STEADILY

C. INCREASED  
SLIGHTLY

D. REMAINED THE  
SAME

E. DECREASED

**NOTE: The scale in the right-hand column will change on the following page.**

## COUNSELOR SURVEY

**CLARITY OF PURPOSE**—The Comprehensive Guidance Program has clearly identified and communicated the goals and expected outcomes of its SEOP process.

95. A district policy exists that precisely outlines the SEOP process.
96. Goals of the SEOP program have been presented to teachers.
- 

**Progress toward achieving the goals of the SEOP process IS EVALUATED BY:**

97. An advisory committee of counselors, educators, and/or parents.
98. Students' and parents' assessments of the SEOP process.
99. Written evaluations from students in exit interviews.
100. Evaluations by counselors or teachers in advisory positions.

**PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**—Parents, community organizations, and businesses are actively involved in all stages of the SEOP process and are kept informed of SEOP goals, activities, and products.

**Students typically access and use their SEOP information or portfolios with their parents:**

101. In the SEOP conference.
102. Outside the formal SEOP conference.

Use the following scale to indicate whether or not the statements in the left-hand column describe your program.

A B C D E  
95 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

A. YES

B. NO

## COUNSELOR SURVEY

### Community members help develop and improve the SEOP process by:

- 103. Donating **money** for career development activities and programs.
- 104. Donating **time** to schools for career development activities.
- 105. Donating computer programs, written material, or other resources for career development.
- 106. Providing opportunities for internships, cooperative work experiences, registered apprenticeships, job shadowing, etc.
- 107. Providing personnel for career fairs, guest speakers, or field trips.
- 108. Participating in groups (advisory or steering committees) that review and manage the SEOP process.

**STUDENT SELF-ASSESSMENT**—Students have multiple opportunities to assess their interests, aptitudes, and academic and extracurricular experience.

### SEOP documents enclosed in a student file or portfolio include:

- 109. Data about the student's individual **interests**, including involvement in school activities.
- 110. Reports on the student's **academic performance**.
- 111. Records of achievement test and **college entrance exam** scores.
- 112. Information from the student's guidance curriculum materials, including **aptitude** assessments.
- 113. Samples of the student's **best academic work**.
- 114. The student's **work history**.
- 115. Report of **special projects** (e.g., community- or service-based learning) for graduation.

Use the following scale to indicate whether or not the statements in the left-hand column describe your program.

A B C D E  
103 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

A. YES

B. NO

## COUNSELOR SURVEY

The following types of student information are systematically considered as students create their SEOP:

- 116. Grades, attendance, and citizenship.
- 117. Results from aptitude tests and interest inventories.
- 118. Records of the student's involvement in school activities.
- 119. Achievement test and college entrance exam scores.
- 120. Other identified talents and hobbies.
- 121. Work history.
- 122. Samples of the student's best academic work.

**CAREER EXPLORATION**—Students are exposed to a wide range of career options and the various education paths which can prepare them for such careers.

- 123. Classes dedicated solely to career exploration or life skills exist.
- 124. Students and counselors use computerized career information delivery systems (e.g., CHOICES).

**The following career exploration programs are offered:**

- 125. Post-high school orientation program.
- 126. Job shadowing (one-day or part-day activity).
- 127. Registered apprenticeships.
- 128. Internships and cooperative work experiences.
- 129. Career days or career fairs.
- 130. Career-related field trips.
- 131. Parent orientation and critical issues programs.
- 132. Guest speakers from local business and service organizations.

Use the following scale to indicate whether or not the statements in the left-hand column describe your program.

A B C D E  
116 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

A. YES

B. NO

## COUNSELOR SURVEY

**STUDENT PLANNING**—Students create specific education and occupation plans designed to help them attain their stated goals.

- 133. All students develop a formalized four- or five-year SEOP.
- 134. Students formally revise and extend their SEOP **every** year based on a longitudinal record of their career goals.
- 135. Student plans address **specific** post-secondary activities.
- 136. All students select a career area as part of the SEOP process.

Use the following scale to indicate whether or not the statements in the left-hand column describe your program.

A B C D E  
133 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

A. YES

B. NO

### As a result of the Comprehensive Guidance Program:

- 137. More students have **built schedules** based on their individual career goals.
- 138. More students are taking **higher level** math, science, and writing classes.
- 139. More students have developed post-secondary education or training plans.
- 140. More students are taking Applied Technology Education classes.
- 141. More students are pursuing courses of study that exceed the ACT core recommendations for graduation (please refer to your ACT "High School Profile Report").

**EXTENT OF SERVICES**—All students receive support in assessing their interests and abilities, surveying their education and occupation options, and developing plans to meet their goals.

**NOTE:** *Special populations include students at risk of dropping out of school, resource students, physically handicapped students, students who speak English as a second language, learning disabled students, etc.*

- 142. **All** students, including those from special populations, meet individually with an advisor or counselor.
- 143. **All** students use career information delivery systems in a structured, systematic manner.



## COUNSELOR SURVEY

**PROGRAM COORDINATION**—The Comprehensive Guidance Program coordinates its processes and products with feeder schools and works cooperatively with overlapping programs within the school.

- 144. Students **use** their SEOP information or portfolios during **all** appropriate guidance activities
- 145. Students **use** their SEOP information or portfolios during academic and vocational classes
- 146. SEOP products or portfolios used at our school have the same basic format as SEOP products used at feeder schools.

**RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**—Resources, including information, personnel, hardware and software, are efficiently employed and made accessible to all students.

- 147. The number (or percentage) of students within each career area is charted.
- 148. Students and counselors use a standard form for keeping SEOP information.
- 149. Students and counselors use **computer programs** (electronic portfolios) to manage SEOP information.
- 150. Counselors **can document** that they spend at least 80% of their time **working directly** with students.
- 151. Counselors **can document** that they spend at least 35% of their time working on the individual planning component of the SEOP.
- 152. Each counselor has received inservice or training on the SEOP process.
- 153. The SEOP training we received was effective.
- 154. Each counselor has learned the necessary skills to carry out his or her SEOP responsibilities.
- 155. The teamwork approach has helped our counseling department manage its time more effectively.

Use the following scale to indicate whether or not the statements in the left-hand column describe your program.

A B C D E  
144 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

A. YES

B. NO

## COUNSELOR SURVEY

**STUDENT SELF-ASSESSMENT**—Students have multiple opportunities to assess their interests, aptitudes, academic, and extracurricular experience.

**The following interest inventories or aptitude tests are administered to students as part of the SEOP process.**

- 156. DAT
- 157. GATB
- 158. PLAN
- 159. CPS or CPP
- 160. SDS
- 161. ASVAB
- 162. COPS, CAPS, and COPES
- 163. Choices
- 164. Choices, Jr.
- 165. Harrington-O'Shea
- 166. Kuder
- 167. Strong-Campbell
- 168. Assessments of learning styles
- 169. Other

Use the following scale to indicate if the test is administered to students at your school.

A B C D E  
156 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

A. YES

B. NO

**NOTE:** The scale in the right-hand column will change on the following page.

## COUNSELOR SURVEY

**PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**—Parents, community organizations and businesses are actively involved in all stages of the SEOP process and are kept informed of SEOP goals, activities, and products.

Please refer to your SEOP conference documentation to answer the following questions. Record the percentage of parents that attended SEOP conferences:

**During the 1995-6 school year:**

- 170. 7<sup>th</sup> grade
- 171. 8<sup>th</sup> grade
- 172. 9<sup>th</sup> grade
- 173. 10<sup>th</sup> grade
- 174. 11<sup>th</sup> grade
- 175. 12<sup>th</sup> grade

**During the 1996-7 school year:**

- 176. 7<sup>th</sup> grade
- 177. 8<sup>th</sup> grade
- 178. 9<sup>th</sup> grade
- 179. 10<sup>th</sup> grade
- 180. 11<sup>th</sup> grade
- 181. 12<sup>th</sup> grade

Use the following scale to indicate the percentage of parents that attended an SEOP conference.

A B C D E  
170 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

A. 95-100%

B. 90-94%

C. 80-89%

D. 70-79%

E. LESS THAN 70%

**NOTES:** If the grade level indicated does not attend your school, leave the item blank.

**If you do not have specific records with the information needed to respond, leave the item blank.**

## COUNSELOR SURVEY

**STUDENT PLANNING**—Students create specific education and occupation plans designed to help them attain their stated goals.

Please refer to your SEOP conference documentation to answer the following questions. Record the percentage of students that attended an **INDIVIDUAL** SEOP conference:

**During the 1995-6 school year:**

- 182. 7<sup>th</sup> grade
- 183. 8<sup>th</sup> grade
- 184. 9<sup>th</sup> grade
- 185. 10<sup>th</sup> grade
- 186. 11<sup>th</sup> grade
- 187. 12<sup>th</sup> grade

**During the 1996-7 school year:**

- 188. 7<sup>th</sup> grade
- 189. 8<sup>th</sup> grade
- 190. 9<sup>th</sup> grade
- 191. 10<sup>th</sup> grade
- 192. 11<sup>th</sup> grade
- 193. 12<sup>th</sup> grade

Use the following scale to indicate the percentage of students that attended an **individual** SEOP conference.

A B C D E  
182 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

A. 95-100%

B. 90-94%

C. 80-89%

D. 70-79%

E. LESS THAN 70%

**NOTES:** If the grade level indicated does not attend your school, leave the item blank.

**If you do not have specific records with the information needed to respond, leave the item blank.**

## COUNSELOR SURVEY

Please refer to your SEOP conference documentation to answer the following questions.

Record the percentage of students that attended a SMALL GROUP SEOP conference during the 1996-7 school year:

- 194. 7<sup>th</sup> grade
  - 195. 8<sup>th</sup> grade
  - 196. 9<sup>th</sup> grade
  - 197. 10<sup>th</sup> grade
  - 198. 11<sup>th</sup> grade
  - 199. 12<sup>th</sup> grade
- 

- 200. Record the percentage of students planning post-secondary education or training.
- 201. Percentage of students who have completed a formalized SEOP.
- 202. Percentage of students who pursue a high school schedule that is consistent with career goals and prepares them for post high school training and/or a job.
- 203. Record the percentage of students whose school-to-careers activities (e.g., apprenticeships, job shadowing, cooperative work experiences) are directly linked to their career goals.

**NOTE:** Please answer the open-ended questions on the sheet of paper provided.

Use the following scale to record the requested percentage of students.

A B C D E  
194 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

A. 95-100%

B. 90-94%

C. 80-89%

D. 70-79%

E. LESS THAN 70%

**NOTES:** If the grade level indicated does not attend your school, leave the item blank.

**If you do not have specific records with the information needed to respond, leave the item blank.**

# **COUNSELOR SURVEY**

## **OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS**

What do you, as a counseling team, consider the most significant success of your Comprehensive Guidance Program?

What especially unique documents or data do you have that support the Comprehensive Guidance Program? (Please include any copies of these items with your survey responses.)

What have been the greatest obstacles you have had to deal with in implementing your Comprehensive Guidance Program?

As a counseling team, what would help you most in your efforts to continue improving your existing program?

How has Comprehensive Guidance affected your overall job satisfaction?

How has the increased emphasis on teamwork affected the performance of your counseling department?





## **APPENDIX B**

### **COMPREHENSIVE GUIDANCE PROGRAM**

#### **PRINCIPAL SURVEY**



# PRINCIPAL SURVEY

## Directions:

Use the accompanying answer sheet to report how the Comprehensive Guidance Program has been implemented at your school. As you read the statements in the left-hand column, use the scale provided in the right-hand column to determine your responses. On the answer sheet provided, mark the appropriate response. Make sure your answer sheet has "Principal Survey Response Form" printed in the top margin of Side Two. If an item does not apply to the grade levels at your school, leave it blank. **YOUR RESPONSES TO THIS SURVEY WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL.**

## Examples:

1. A district policy exists that precisely outlines the SEOP process.

A B C D E  
1 ○ ○ ○ ○ ●

In this case, the respondent marked "E," meaning that no district policy outlining the SEOP process exists.

32. In my school, teachers are trained to understand their SEOP role.

A B C D E  
32 ○ ● ○ ○ ○ ○

In this case, the respondent has marked "B." This response indicates that MOST teachers at the school are trained to understand their role in the SEOP process.

Use the following scale to indicate how accurately the statements in the left-hand column describe your program.

A B C D E  
1 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

**THE STATEMENT IS:**

A. **EXTREMELY ACCURATE**

B. **VERY ACCURATE**

C. **REASONABLY ACCURATE**

D. **NOT VERY ACCURATE**

E. **NOT AT ALL ACCURATE**

**NOTE: If an item does not apply to your school, leave it blank.**

## PRINCIPAL SURVEY

1. A district policy exists that precisely outlines the SEOP process.
  2. An SEOP policy statement, based on district policy, has been created at my school.
  3. Memos about SEOP activities are provided to all teachers.
  4. Teachers receive inservice or training on the SEOP process.
  5. Teachers are carefully selected and trained when used as advisors in the SEOP process.
  6. Information about the SEOP process is presented to parents at school meetings (e.g., PTA, Orientation, Back-to-School Night).
- 

**As principal, I :**

7. Organize special faculty meetings on the SEOP process.
  8. Require inservice on the SEOP process.
  9. Ensure that school goals related to the SEOP process are created and actively supported.
  10. Participate in an **active role** in the SEOP process.
  11. Hold counselors responsible for following school and district policy concerning the SEOP process.
  12. Foster community involvement in the SEOP process.
  13. Work to improve student and community support for the SEOP process.
  14. Recruit local businesses to provide opportunities (career learning experiences) for students.
- 

**Community members help develop and improve the SEOP process by:**

15. Donating money for career development activities and programs.
16. Donating time to schools for career development activities.
17. Donating computer programs, written material, or other resources for career development.

Use the following scale to indicate how accurately the statements in the left-hand column describe your program.

A B C D E  
1 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

**THE STATEMENT IS:**

A. **EXTREMELY ACCURATE**

B. **VERY ACCURATE**

C. **REASONABLY ACCURATE**

D. **NOT VERY ACCURATE**

E. **NOT AT ALL ACCURATE**

**NOTE: If an item does not apply to your school, leave it blank.**

## PRINCIPAL SURVEY

18. As principal, I meet with school counselors to establish a budget that will support the Comprehensive Guidance Program and related materials.
19. At my school, an adequate career center exists that helps introduce students to a wide range of career choices.
20. The SEOP process is coordinated (e.g., products are shared and jointly developed, activities are coordinated) with schools in our feeder system.

Use the following scale to indicate how accurately the statements in the left-hand column describe your program.

A B C D E

18 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

**The district keeps me informed about:**

**THE STATEMENT IS:**

21. **Resources available** for the Comprehensive Guidance Program.
22. **Budget requirements** of the Comprehensive Guidance Program.
23. The district gives direction on the use of Comprehensive Guidance funds.
24. All students meet **individually** with an advisor or counselor **every year**.
25. Students are exposed to a wide range of career options as part of the guidance curriculum and SEOP conference.
26. Classes dedicated solely to career exploration or life skills exist.
27. School-to-careers initiatives (e.g., registered apprenticeships, tech prep, academy programs, internships) are linked to students' SEOP goals.
28. As a result of the Comprehensive Guidance Program, more students are taking **higher level** math, science, and writing classes.
29. As a result of the Comprehensive Guidance Program, more students are taking Applied Technology Education classes.
30. All students develop a formalized four- or five-year SEOP.
31. Students formally revise and extend their SEOP **every year**.
32. In my school, teachers are trained to understand their SEOP role.
33. As principal, I assume responsibility for the overall success of the Comprehensive Guidance Program at my school.
34. With respect to the SEOP process, I make certain that counselors are implementing district policy and state law at my school.

A. **EXTREMELY ACCURATE**

B. **VERY ACCURATE**

C. **REASONABLY ACCURATE**

D. **NOT VERY ACCURATE**

E. **NOT AT ALL ACCURATE**

**NOTE: If an item does not apply to your school, leave it blank.**

## PRINCIPAL SURVEY

**Rate the extent of DISTRICT-LEVEL SUPPORT for the SEOP process and products in the following areas:**

- 35. Development of guidance curriculum.
- 36. Inservice assistance.
- 37. Modifying programs, course offerings, and curriculum to meet student needs.
- 38. Coordination (both vertical and horizontal) among schools.
- 39. Articulation of the SEOP process.
- 40. Providing leadership on the Comprehensive Guidance Program.

**NOTE: The scale in the right-hand column has changed.**

Use the following scale to rate district-level support for the areas described in the statements of the left-hand column.

A B C D E

35 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

A. **EXTENSIVE**

B. **MORE THAN ADEQUATE**

C. **ADEQUATE**

D. **SOMEWHAT LIMITED**

E. **VERY LIMITED**

**Over the past several years:**

- 41. Parent involvement in the SEOP process has . . .
- 42. Teacher support of the SEOP process has . . .
- 43. The amount of time devoted to guidance activities has . . .
- 44. The amount of counselor time and resources devoted to SEOP activities has . . .

**NOTE: The scale in the right-hand column has changed.**

Use the following scale to complete the statements in the left-hand column.

A B C D E

40 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

A. **INCREASED DRAMATICALLY**

B. **INCREASED STEADILY**

C. **INCREASED SLIGHTLY**

D. **REMAINED THE SAME**

E. **DECREASED**

# **PRINCIPAL SURVEY**

## **OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS**

What is the most significant success of the Comprehensive Guidance Program at your school?

What has been the greatest obstacle you have had to deal with in implementing Comprehensive Guidance at your school?

What would help you most in your efforts to continue improving your existing guidance program?





# **APPENDIX C**

## **COMPREHENSIVE GUIDANCE PROGRAM**

### **TEACHER SURVEY**



# TEACHER SURVEY

## Directions:

Use the accompanying answer sheet to report how the Comprehensive Guidance Program has been implemented at your school. As you read the statements in the left-hand column, use the scale provided in the right-hand column to determine your responses. On the answer sheet provided, mark the appropriate response. Make sure your answer sheet has "Teacher Survey Response Form" printed in the top margin of Side Two. If an item does not apply to the grade levels at your school, leave it blank. **YOUR RESPONSES TO THIS SURVEY WILL BE KEPT STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL.**

## Examples:

1. Teachers receive memos about SEOP activities.

A B C D E  
1 ○ ○ ○ ○ ●

In this case, the respondent marked "E," meaning that teachers do **not** receive memos about any SEOP activities.

Use the following scale to indicate how accurately the statements in the left-hand column describe your program.

A B C D E  
1 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

**THE STATEMENT IS:**

13. Teachers infuse career exploration into their regular curriculum.

A B C D E  
13 ○ ● ○ ○ ○ ○

In this case, the respondent has marked "B." This response indicates that **MOST** teachers at the school infuse career exploration into their regular curriculum.

A. **EXTREMELY ACCURATE**

B. **VERY ACCURATE**

C. **REASONABLY ACCURATE**

D. **NOT VERY ACCURATE**

E. **NOT AT ALL ACCURATE**

**NOTE: If an item does not apply to your school, leave it blank.**

## TEACHER SURVEY

1. Teachers receive memos about SEOP activities.
2. The administration ensures that school goals related to the SEOP process are created and supported.
3. Teachers support school goals related to the SEOP process.
4. Teachers are carefully selected and trained when used as advisors in the SEOP process.
5. Inservice or training on the SEOP process is provided for **all** teachers.
6. Teachers have access to the SEOP goals of their students.
7. Students in my classes know which career area they have selected without having to look it up in their SEOP folder.
8. Teachers modify planned learning activities based on the SEOP goals of students in their classroom.
9. At my school, an adequate career center exists that helps introduce students to a wide range of career choices.
10. Teachers receive an orientation to the career center.
11. The career center at my school is highly accessible and available to students and teachers.
12. Teachers use the career center and other resources (e.g., videos, computer software, print material) for regular classroom instruction.
13. Teachers infuse career exploration into their regular curriculum.
14. Teachers are given sufficient time to carry out assigned SEOP duties.

Use the following scale to indicate how accurately the statements in the left-hand column describe your program.

A B C D E  
1 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

**THE STATEMENT IS:**

**A. EXTREMELY ACCURATE**

**B. VERY ACCURATE**

**C. REASONABLY ACCURATE**

**D. NOT VERY ACCURATE**

**E. NOT AT ALL ACCURATE**

**NOTE: If an item does not apply to your school, leave it blank.**

**NOTE: The scale in the right-hand column will change on the following page.**

## TEACHER SURVEY

15. I am familiar with the SEOP process at my school.
16. I am involved as an advisor or instructor in the SEOP process.
17. I have received inservice or training on the SEOP process.
18. The SEOP training I received was effective.
19. I have learned the necessary skills to carry out my SEOP responsibilities.
20. I am given enough time for my SEOP responsibilities.
21. As a result of the Comprehensive Guidance Program, more class time has been devoted to guidance activities.
22. Students use their SEOP information or portfolios in my class.
23. All students in my school develop a formalized four- or five-year SEOP.
24. All students in my school select a career area as part of the SEOP process.

Use the following scale to indicate whether or not the statements in the left-hand column describe your situation.

A B C D E  
15 ○ ○ ○ ○ ○

A. YES

B. NO

**NOTE: If an item does not apply to your school, leave it blank.**

## **TEACHER SURVEY**

### **OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS**

What is the most significant success of the Comprehensive Guidance Program at your school?

What has been the greatest obstacle you have had to deal with in implementing Comprehensive Guidance at your school?

What would help you most in your efforts to continue improving the existing guidance program at your school?



## **APPENDIX D**

### **COMPREHENSIVE GUIDANCE PROGRAM**

#### **COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS**



# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)		PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION													
			Junior High School: N = 90					High School: N = 86								
			A. EXTREMELY ACCURATE (5)	JHS	HS	B. VERY ACCURATE (4)	JHS	HS	C. REASONABLY ACCURATE (3)	JHS	HS	D. NOT VERY ACCURATE (2)	JHS	HS	E. NOT AT ALL ACCURATE (1)	JHS
CLARITY OF PURPOSE—The Comprehensive Guidance Program has clearly identified and communicated the goals and expected outcomes of its SEOP process.																
1. All teachers receive <b>memos</b> about SEOP activities.	4.12	3.83	51%	40%	19%	22%	22%	24%	7%	9%	1%	5%				
2. All teachers receive <b>inservice</b> or <b>training</b> on the SEOP process.	3.83	3.76	41%	37%	24%	27%	18%	17%	10%	12%	7%	7%				
3. Information about the SEOP process is presented to parents at school meetings (e.g., PTA, Orientation, Back-to-School Night).	4.03	4.20	48%	45%	23%	37%	17%	12%	9%	5%	3%	1%				
4. The PTA helps contact and inform parents about the SEOP process.	2.01	2.41	4%	18%	10%	7%	18%	13%	17%	24%	51%	39%				
5. Teachers know about and have access to products which support the SEOP process (e.g., registration and goal setting forms, CHOICES printouts, curriculum materials).	3.83	4.05	37%	40%	21%	34%	31%	20%	11%	6%	0%	1%				
6. Parents know beforehand what will be expected of them in the SEOP conference.	4.08	4.01	43%	37%	27%	36%	25%	17%	3%	9%	1%	0%				

# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION									
		Junior High School: N = 90					High School: N = 86				
		A. EXTREMELY ACCURATE (5)		B. VERY ACCURATE (4)		C. REASONABLY ACCURATE (3)		D. NOT VERY ACCURATE (2)		E. NOT AT ALL ACCURATE (1)	
		JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS
7. Parents are supportive of the SEOP process.	4.26	4.22	4.22	51%	47%	26%	31%	21%	20%	2%	0%
8. Teachers understand their roles in the SEOP process.	3.54	3.71	3.71	17%	26%	36%	36%	38%	26%	6%	3%
9. Teachers support counselor efforts to achieve SEOP goals.	4.14	4.12	4.12	39%	40%	38%	41%	22%	13%	1%	1%
10. The administration receives information about all changes made to the SEOP process and products.	4.51	4.47	4.47	67%	65%	22%	23%	7%	6%	4%	1%
11. All school personnel (both administration and teachers) know about all scheduled SEOP activities several weeks in advance.	4.28	3.70	3.70	51%	31%	28%	28%	19%	23%	2%	3%
12. SEOP conferences are conducted according to school and district policy.	4.81	4.80	4.80	87%	83%	8%	15%	6%	2%	0%	0%
<b>The school administration:</b>											
13. Organizes special faculty meetings on the SEOP process.	3.51	3.21	3.21	32%	26%	23%	28%	19%	10%	14%	22%
14. Requires inservice on the SEOP process.	3.34	3.17	3.17	34%	27%	15%	26%	19%	10%	15%	24%
15. Creates and supports school goals related to SEOP.	4.29	4.20	4.20	60%	49%	22%	33%	8%	12%	3%	3%
16. Participates in an active role in the SEOP process.	3.61	3.86	3.86	39%	42%	18%	21%	19%	23%	11%	5%

# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION													
		Junior High School: N = 90					High School: N = 86								
		A. EXTREMELY ACCURATE (5)	B. VERY ACCURATE (4)	C. REASONABLY ACCURATE (3)	D. NOT VERY ACCURATE (2)	E. NOT AT ALL ACCURATE (1)	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS			
PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT—Parents, community organizations, and businesses are actively involved in all stages of the SEOP process and are kept informed of SEOP goals, activities, and products.	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS
17. The school actively schedules SEOP conferences with parents, making phone calls and scheduling night time conferences when necessary.	4.68	4.49	77%	63%	16%	27%	7%	7%	1%	3%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%
18. Parents receive SEOP products (graduation requirements, CHOICES printouts, students' previous goals) prior to the SEOP conference.	2.89	2.92	20%	16%	15%	20%	20%	22%	24%	23%	21%	19%	19%	19%	19%
19. Parents and students are informed about career exploration activities and programs in a variety of ways (e.g., school marquees, letters mailed directly to parents, telephone calling networks).	3.73	4.00	35%	34%	21%	38%	30%	22%	9%	6%	4%	0%	0%	0%	0%

# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)		PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION									
			Junior High School: N = 90					High School: N = 86				
			A. EXTREMELY ACCURATE (5)	B. VERY ACCURATE (4)	C. REASONABLY ACCURATE (3)	D. NOT VERY ACCURATE (2)	E. NOT AT ALL ACCURATE (1)	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT—Resources, including information, personnel, hardware and software, are efficiently employed and made accessible to all students.												
20. The SEOP process is clearly <b>labeled by name</b> and explained to parents in the SEOP conference.	4.73	4.56	79%	66%	17%	24%	3%	8%	1%	1%	0%	0%
21. Parents are informed about the purpose of the SEOP process (beyond course registration) in the conference.	4.77	4.60	81%	67%	17%	27%	1%	5%	0%	1%	1%	0%
22. Teachers are carefully selected and trained when used as advisors in the SEOP process.	4.08	3.63	56%	37%	23%	27%	5%	14%	3%	5%	12%	17%
23. Teachers have access to the career goals of their students.	3.99	4.17	46%	51%	24%	26%	18%	16%	8%	3%	4%	3%
24. Most teachers include career guidance activities as part of their curriculum.	3.51	3.58	16%	24%	36%	26%	33%	38%	15%	11%	1%	2%
25. Teachers receive an orientation to the career center.	2.56	2.85	13%	14%	15%	19%	19%	28%	21%	17%	32%	22%
26. All students visit the career center at least once during the year.	3.75	3.58	52%	37%	7%	14%	19%	27%	7%	14%	14%	8%



# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION							
		Junior High School: N = 90				High School: N = 86			
		A. EXTREMELY ACCURATE (5)	B. VERY ACCURATE (4)	C. REASONABLY ACCURATE (3)	D. NOT VERY ACCURATE (2)	E. NOT AT ALL ACCURATE (1)			
		JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS
27. Career fairs, job shadowing, guest speakers, etc., are of high quality and provide up-to-date, hands-on information to students.	4.13 4.31	48% 55%	33% 28%	9% 13%	2% 3%	7% 1%			
28. Counselors and teachers who act as advisors are aware of trends in the SEOP goals and interests of students.	4.43 4.38	57% 53%	34% 34%	6% 10%	1% 2%	2% 0%			
29. Course offerings change in response to trends in students' SEOP goals.	3.34 3.74	30% 32%	16% 35%	21% 15%	23% 11%	10% 7%			
30. Counselors <b>receive</b> and <b>use</b> information about the SEOP goals and interests of students entering their school (e.g., the freshman class, in-state transfer students).	3.19 3.55	23% 31%	21% 27%	21% 19%	23% 14%	13% 9%			
31. Career days, job fairs, job shadowing, field trips, etc., cover a wide range of career choices.	4.26 4.37	56% 62%	26% 21%	11% 10%	2% 7%	5% 0%			
32. Sufficient time and personnel are set aside to meet the requirements of the SEOP process.	3.89 3.78	43% 42%	27% 26%	13% 9%	9% 15%	8% 8%			
33. In our school, the time needed to manage the SEOP process <b>does not</b> <b>infringe</b> on the responsive services provided.	2.82 3.03	18% 21%	12% 23%	27% 14%	21% 22%	22% 20%			



# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION						
		Junior High School: N = 90			High School: N = 86			
		A. EXTREMELY ACCURATE (5)	B. VERY ACCURATE (4)	C. REASONABLY ACCURATE (3)	D. NOT VERY ACCURATE (2)	E. NOT AT ALL ACCURATE (1)		
	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS		
34. As a counseling team, the training we received on the Comprehensive Guidance Program has enabled us to perform more effectively.	4.03 4.16	42% 51%	31% 24%	19% 15%	4% 8%	3% 1%		
35. All counselors in our school have acquired the skills needed to implement a highly successful Comprehensive Guidance Program.	4.54 4.62	66% 67%	23% 27%	11% 6%	0% 0%	0% 0%		
36. Our counseling department receives sufficient funding to implement a highly successful Comprehensive Guidance Program.	3.36 3.51	29% 31%	20% 23%	20% 22%	18% 12%	12% 12%		
<b>Career center characteristics:</b>								
37. Career guidance software programs (e.g., CHOICES) are accessible throughout the school: in regular classrooms, writing and computer labs, the career center, and counselors' offices.	3.59 3.85	31% 47%	26% 16%	21% 18%	15% 12%	7% 7%		
38. Work-based information is posted (e.g., job placement, internships, job shadowing, career fairs).	2.81 4.28	12% 51%	21% 31%	29% 13%	13% 3%	25% 1%		

# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION					
		Junior High School: N = 90		High School: N = 86			
		A. EXTREMELY ACCURATE (5)	B. VERY ACCURATE (4)	C. REASONABLY ACCURATE (3)	D. NOT VERY ACCURATE (2)	E. NOT AT ALL ACCURATE (1)	
		JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	
39. Scholarship information is posted (e.g., contests, summer educational opportunities, extracurricular activities).	2.84	12%	21%	31%	12%	24%	0%
40. The center can accommodate the number of students in a typical class.	2.90	19%	22%	16%	12%	30%	24%
41. All students receive a formal orientation to the center.	2.95	22%	17%	23%	12%	26%	9%
42. Students frequently use the center before, during, and after school (outside of regular classes).	2.32	6%	16%	17%	24%	37%	8%
As a result of the Comprehensive Guidance Program:							
43. Counselors receive and use information about the SEOP goals and interests of students entering their school (e.g., the freshman class, in-state transfer students).	3.19	19%	34%	13%	15%	19%	2%
44. More class time has been devoted to guidance activities.	4.14	43%	34%	16%	7%	0%	1%
45. More counselor time and resources have been devoted to SEOP activities.	4.64	72%	24%	2%	1%	1%	0%

# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION										
		Junior High School: N = 90					High School: N = 86					
		A. EXTREMELY ACCURATE (5)		B. VERY ACCURATE (4)		C. REASONABLY ACCURATE (3)		D. NOT VERY ACCURATE (2)		E. NOT AT ALL ACCURATE (1)		
	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS
Resources (e.g., videos, computer software, print material) used to introduce students to career choices:												
46. Are readily available.	3.98	4.27	36%	50%	30%	33%	30%	12%	5%	6%	0%	0%
47. Cover a wide range of career choices.	4.18	4.35	47%	52%	28%	33%	22%	13%	3%	2%	0%	0%
48. Are of high quality and provide up-to-date information.	3.94	4.15	32%	42%	38%	36%	24%	17%	7%	5%	0%	0%
Students typically use their SEOP information or portfolios:												
49. During meetings (other than SEOP conferences) with advisors or counselors.	2.96	3.52	18%	26%	15%	26%	26%	30%	28%	13%	13%	6%
50. During guidance activities other than the SEOP conference.	3.21	3.43	21%	17%	26%	35%	18%	29%	24%	10%	11%	8%
51. During both academic and Applied Technology Education classes.	2.86	2.79	13%	3%	22%	23%	23%	30%	22%	35%	20%	8%
52. When working in the career center.	3.18	3.55	16%	22%	31%	35%	24%	25%	13%	11%	16%	7%
53. When results from aptitude tests are presented.	3.41	3.77	28%	31%	25%	36%	20%	16%	9%	10%	8%	6%

## COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION						
		Junior High School: N = 90			High School: N = 86			
		A. EXTREMELY ACCURATE (5)	B. VERY ACCURATE (4)	C. REASONABLY ACCURATE (3)	D. NOT VERY ACCURATE (2)	E. NOT AT ALL ACCURATE (1)		
		JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	
54. When results from achievement tests are presented.	3.69	31%	31%	09%	20%	23%	9%	12%
55. Frequently on their own.	2.13	3%	3%	16%	29%	34%	30%	31%
<b>PROGRAM COORDINATION—The</b> Comprehensive Guidance Program coordinates its processes and products with schools within its feeder system and works cooperatively with overlapping programs within the school.								
56. Guidance curriculum activities provide orientation to SEOP conferences.	4.19	49%	36%	30%	40%	12%	10%	6%
57. Guidance curriculum is integrated with existing classes.	4.31	54%	36%	26%	34%	18%	26%	2%
58. SEOP products for all students are received from and shared with schools within our feeder system (junior high or middle schools, post-secondary institutions, Applied Technology Centers, etc.).	4.13	55%	46%	17%	27%	19%	12%	4%
59. The SEOP process and products are jointly developed with representatives within our feeder system.	3.79	35%	36%	28%	31%	24%	21%	8%
								7%
								6%
								5%

## COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION						
		Junior High School: N = 90		High School: N = 86				
		A. EXTREMELY ACCURATE (5)	B. VERY ACCURATE (4)	C. REASONABLY ACCURATE (3)	D. NOT VERY ACCURATE (2)	E. NOT AT ALL ACCURATE (1)		
		JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS		
60. The guidance curriculum has been jointly designed with representatives within our feeder system.	JHS 3.44 HS 3.63	22% 30%	28% 24%	28% 2%	13% 13%	8% 5%		
61. Teachers and counselors jointly plan guidance curriculum to make it relevant to ongoing activities in the classroom.	3.49 3.19	19% 9%	34% 38%	28% 27%	16% 13%	3% 13%		
62. Counselors regularly work with the school-to-careers coordinators at the school or district level to coordinate their efforts and activities.	3.46 4.28	24% 52%	32% 32%	22% 11%	12% 5%	11% 1%		
63. Guidance activities have been coordinated with guidance activities at schools within our feeder system.	3.43 3.66	20% 26%	39% 37%	15% 20%	16% 13%	10% 5%		

**EXTENT OF SERVICES**—All students receive support in assessing their interests and abilities, surveying their education and occupation options, and developing plans to meet their goals.

**NOTE:** Special populations include students at risk of dropping out of school, resource students, students with disabilities, students who speak English as a second language, learning disabled students, etc.



# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION							
		Junior High School: N = 90				High School: N = 86			
		A. EXTREMELY ACCURATE (5)	B. VERY ACCURATE (4)	C. REASONABLY ACCURATE (3)	D. NOT VERY ACCURATE (2)	E. NOT AT ALL ACCURATE (1)			
		JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS			
64. All students, including the special populations, receive equal treatment in the SEOP process.	4.66	78% 4.71	17% 4.71	2% 4.71	1% 4.71	2% 4.71			0%
65. Special efforts are made to contact the parents of students at risk of dropping out of school to encourage those parents to attend SEOP conferences.	3.76	36% 4.09	29% 4.09	19% 4.09	7% 4.09	2% 4.09			3%
66. Appropriate accommodations (e.g., translators) are made for special-population students when they take interest inventories and aptitude tests.	3.68	35% 3.63	25% 3.63	21% 3.63	11% 3.63	11% 3.63			8%
67. Students at risk of dropping out of school are identified in a proactive manner and given additional support in the SEOP process.	3.55	29% 3.92	27% 3.92	25% 3.92	7% 3.92	5% 3.92			2%
68. Special-population students are included in career exploration activities relevant to their abilities and goals.	4.34	52% 4.52	33% 4.52	15% 4.52	0% 4.52	0% 4.52			0%
69. Guest speakers from diverse demographic backgrounds are invited to make presentations to all students.	3.63	34% 3.47	24% 3.47	18% 3.47	16% 3.47	14% 3.47			9%
70. Counselors coordinate activities with personnel who work with members of the special populations.	4.17	50% 4.27	27% 4.27	15% 4.27	6% 4.27	0% 4.27			1%

## COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION				
		Junior High School: N = 90		High School: N = 86		
		A. EXTREMELY ACCURATE (5)	B. VERY ACCURATE (4)	C. REASONABLY ACCURATE (3)	D. NOT VERY ACCURATE (2)	E. NOT AT ALL ACCURATE (1)
		JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS
71. Students who plan to attend post-secondary institutions receive support in the following ways: applying for appropriate exams, obtaining admissions applications, and submitting relevant financial aid forms.	JHS 3.03 HS 4.78	JHS 24% HS 80%	JHS 20% HS 17%	JHS 20% HS 2%	JHS 7% HS 0%	JHS 29% HS 0%
STUDENT PLANNING—Students create specific education and occupation plans designed to help them attain their stated goals.						
72. Students are exposed to a wide range of career options as part of the guidance curriculum and SEOP conference.	4.61	67%	56%	34%	7%	9%
73. Students are exposed to a wide range of school-to-careers opportunities as part of the SEOP process.	3.76	31%	33%	39%	24%	25%
74. Students are introduced to school-to-careers activities (e.g., registered apprenticeships, tech prep, academy programs, internships) that are related to their career goals.	3.18	21%	34%	41%	29%	20%
75. There is a mechanism in place in our SEOP process to assure that students' schedules are consistent with their selected career goals.	3.58	30%	36%	30%	23%	21%
					0%	1%
					6%	1%
					12%	16%
					5%	13%
						3%

# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION									
		Junior High School: N=90					High School: N=86				
		A. EXTENSIVE SUPPORT (5)	B. MORE THAN ADEQUATE SUPPORT (4)	C. ADEQUATE SUPPORT (3)	D. SOMEWHAT LIMITED SUPPORT (2)	E. VERY LIMITED SUPPORT (1)					
		JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS
<b>PROGRAM COORDINATION—The</b> Comprehensive Guidance Program coordinates its processes and products with schools within its feeder system and works cooperatively with overlapping programs within the school.											
<b>Rate the extent of DISTRICT-LEVEL SUPPORT for the SEOP process and products in the following areas:</b>											
76. Development of guidance curriculum.	3.75	3.33	38%	28%	23%	20%	23%	11%	15%	6%	14%
77. SEOP documentation and career planning forms.	3.55	3.42	27%	29%	32%	25%	18%	14%	17%	9%	12%
78. Career assessment (e.g., aptitude tests, interest inventories, assessments of learning styles).	3.37	3.72	23%	38%	26%	22%	21%	15%	12%	10%	7%
79. Inservice assistance.	3.75	3.66	33%	31%	31%	27%	19%	13%	13%	5%	5%
80. Coordination (both vertical and horizontal) among schools.	3.52	3.29	28%	22%	25%	24%	23%	18%	22%	6%	8%
81. Joint planning.	3.51	3.42	26%	26%	28%	23%	24%	11%	21%	9%	6%
82. Soliciting input about <b>budget needs</b> .	3.38	3.12	27%	20%	25%	26%	20%	10%	12%	16%	21%
83. Modifying programs, course offerings, and curriculum to meet student needs.	2.95	3.08	12%	14%	22%	30%	31%	19%	21%	16%	14%



## COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION									
		Junior High School: N = 90					High School: N = 86				
		A. EXTENSIVE SUPPORT (5)		B. MORE THAN ADEQUATE SUPPORT (4)		C. ADEQUATE SUPPORT (3)		D. SOMEWHAT LIMITED SUPPORT (2)		E. VERY LIMITED SUPPORT (1)	
		JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS
84. Providing an explanation on how to implement the district policy for the SEOP process.	3.34	17%	26%	31%	25%	29%	29%	15%	10%	8%	11%
85. <b>Accountability</b> —the district follows up and encourages schools to complete Comprehensive Guidance Program requirements.	4.13	46%	47%	32%	28%	13%	9%	7%	11%	2%	5%
86. <b>Supplying resources</b> needed to successfully implement the SEOP process.	3.41	24%	26%	25%	25%	30%	22%	11%	15%	10%	12%
87. <b>Providing leadership</b> on implementation of the Comprehensive Guidance Program.	3.59	32%	33%	25%	22%	18%	22%	17%	12%	7%	11%

# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)		PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION									
			Junior High School: N-90					High School: N-86				
			A. INCREASED DRAMATICALLY (5)	B. INCREASED STEADILY (4)	C. INCREASED SLIGHTLY (3)	D. REMAINED THE SAME (2)	E. DECREASED (1)					
	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS
<b>Over the past several years:</b>												
88. The percentage of parents involved in the SEOP process has ...	3.90	4.19	33%	31%	40%	60%	11%	7%	13%	2%	2%	0%
89. Community involvement in the SEOP process has ...	3.43	3.82	12%	19%	44%	51%	22%	25%	20%	6%	2%	0%
90. Student interest in the SEOP process has ...	3.85	4.02	20%	26%	56%	56%	16%	12%	9%	6%	0%	0%
91. The extent of district-level support has ...	3.62	3.64	18%	18%	43%	45%	22%	22%	17%	14%	0%	1%
92. The amount of counselor time devoted to working directly with students has ...	3.93	4.05	31%	38%	47%	40%	9%	14%	9%	6%	3%	2%
93. The amount of time dedicated to responsive services has ...	2.40	2.41	8%	5%	19%	24%	13%	15%	25%	21%	35%	35%
94. The level of coordination within our feeder system on the SEOP process has ...	3.50	3.85	19%	24%	32%	48%	28%	18%	20%	11%	0%	0%

# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION				
	Junior High School: N = 90		High School: N = 86		
	A. YES	B. NO			
	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	
CLARITY OF PURPOSE—The Comprehensive Guidance Program has clearly identified and communicated the goals and expected outcomes of its SEOP process.					
95. A district policy exists that precisely outlines the SEOP process.	69%	78%	31%	22%	
96. Goals of the SEOP program have been presented to teachers.	84%	82%	16%	18%	
Progress toward achieving the goals of the SEOP process IS EVALUATED BY:					
97. An advisory committee of counselors, educators, and/or parents.	92%	85%	8%	15%	
98. Students' and parents' assessments of the SEOP process.	82%	68%	18%	32%	
99. Written evaluations from students in exit interviews.	15%	31%	85%	69%	
100. Evaluations by counselors or teachers in advisory positions.	76%	82%	24%	18%	

# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION				
	Junior High School: N = 90      High School: N = 86				
	A. YES		B. NO		
	JHS	HS	JHS	JHS	HS
<b>PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</b> —Parents, community organizations, and businesses are actively involved in all stages of the SEOP process and are kept informed of SEOP goals, activities, and products.					
<b>Students typically access and use their SEOP information or portfolios with their parents:</b>					
101. In the SEOP conference.	98%	92%	2%	8%	
102. Outside the formal SEOP conference.	45%	57%	55%	43%	
<b>Community members help develop and improve the SEOP process by:</b>					
103. Donating money for career development activities and programs.	16%	17%	84%	83%	
104. Donating time to schools for career development activities.	72%	81%	28%	19%	
105. Donating computer programs, written material, or other resources for career development.	27%	29%	73%	71%	
106. Providing opportunities for internships, cooperative work experiences, registered apprenticeships, job shadowing, etc.	55%	94%	45%	6%	
107. Providing personnel for career fairs, guest speakers, or field trips.	93%	98%	7%	2%	

# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION				
	Junior High School: N = 90		High School: N = 86		
	A. YES	B. NO			
	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	
108. Participating in groups (advisory or steering committees) that review and manage the SEOP process.	84%	84%	16%	16%	
STUDENT SELF-ASSESSMENT—Students have multiple opportunities to assess their interests, aptitudes, and academic and extracurricular experience.					
SEOP documents enclosed in a student file or portfolio include:					
109. Data about the student's individual interests, including involvement in school activities.	94%	90%	6%	10%	
110. Reports on the student's academic performance.	86%	95%	14%	5%	
111. Records of achievement test and college entrance exam scores.	73%	92%	28%	8%	
112. Information from the student's guidance curriculum materials, including aptitude assessments.	85%	93%	15%	7%	
113. Samples of the student's best academic work.	20%	18%	80%	82%	
114. The student's work history.	37%	45%	63%	55%	
115. Report of special projects (e.g., community- or service-based learning) for graduation.	38%	40%	62%	60%	

# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION				
	Junior High School: N=90		High School: N=86		
	A. YES	B. NO			
	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	
The following types of student information are systematically considered as students create their SEOP:					
116. Grades, attendance, and citizenship.	83%	95%	17%	5%	
117. Results from aptitude tests and interest inventories.	99%	99%	1%	1%	
118. Records of the student's involvement in school activities.	61%	67%	39%	33%	
119. Achievement test and college entrance exam scores.	82%	96%	18%	4%	
120. Other identified talents and hobbies.	89%	73%	11%	27%	
121. Work history.	40%	60%	60%	40%	
122. Samples of the student's best academic work.	20%	15%	80%	85%	
CAREER EXPLORATION—Students are exposed to a wide range of career options and the various education paths which can prepare them for such careers.					
123. Classes dedicated solely to career exploration or life skills exist.	82%	81%	18%	19%	
124. Students and counselors use computerized career information delivery systems (e.g., CHOICES).	92%	98%	9%	2%	



# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION					
	Junior High School: N = 90				High School: N = 86	
	A. YES		B. NO			
The following career exploration programs are offered:						
125. Post-high school orientation program.	JHS	HS	JHS	HS		
126. Job shadowing (one-day or part-day activity).	38%	98%	62%	2%		
127. Registered apprenticeships.	48%	71%	52%	29%		
128. Internships and cooperative work experiences.	8%	67%	92%	33%		
129. Career days or career fairs.	20%	93%	80%	7%		
130. Career-related field trips.	82%	92%	18%	8%		
131. Parent orientation and critical issues programs.	74%	93%	26%	7%		
132. Guest speakers from local business and service organizations.	64%	76%	36%	24%		
STUDENT PLANNING—Students create specific education and occupation plans designed to help them attain their stated goals.						
133. All students develop a formalized four- or five-year SEOP.	88%	95%	12%	5%		
134. Students formally revise and extend their SEOP every year based on a longitudinal record of their career goals.	83%	89%	17%	11%		
135. Student plans address <b>specific</b> post-secondary activities.	98%	95%	2%	5%		
	75%	95%	25%	5%		

# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION				
	Junior High School: N = 90		High School: N = 86		
	A. YES		B. NO		
	JHS	HS	JHS	JHS	HS
136. All students select a career area as part of the SEOP process.	88%	89%	12%	11%	
<b>As a result of the Comprehensive Guidance Program:</b>					
137. More students have <b>built schedules</b> based on their individual career goals.	80%	95%	20%	5%	
138. More students are taking <b>higher level</b> math, science, and writing classes.	69%	83%	31%	17%	
139. More students have developed post-secondary education or training plans.	83%	94%	17%	6%	
140. More students are taking Applied Technology Education classes.	71%	89%	29%	11%	
141. More students are pursuing courses of study that exceed the ACT core recommendations for graduation (please refer to your ACT "High School Profile Report").	69%	65%	31%	35%	
<b>EXTENT OF SERVICES</b> —All students receive support in assessing their interests and abilities, surveying their education and occupation options, and developing plans to meet their goals. <b>NOTE:</b> Special populations include students at risk of dropping out of school, resource students, physically handicapped students, students who speak English as a second language, learning disabled students, etc.					



# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION				
	Junior High School: N = 90		High School: N = 86		
	A. YES		B. NO		
	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	
142. All students, including those from special populations, meet individually with an advisor or counselor.	91%	95%	9%	5%	
143. All students use career information delivery systems in a structured, systematic manner.	81%	83%	19%	17%	
PROGRAM COORDINATION—The Comprehensive Guidance Program coordinates its processes and products with feeder schools and works cooperatively with overlapping programs within the school.					
144. Students use their SEOP information or portfolios during all appropriate guidance activities	66%	68%	34%	32%	
145. Students use their SEOP information or portfolios during academic and vocational classes	35%	36%	65%	64%	
146. SEOP products or portfolios used at our school have the same basic format as SEOP products used at feeder schools.	72%	80%	28%	20%	
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT—Resources, including information, personnel, hardware and software, are efficiently employed and made accessible to all students.					
147. The number (or percentage) of students within each career area is charted.	10%	30%	90%	70%	
148. Students and counselors use a standard form for keeping SEOP information.	93%	98%	7%	2%	

# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION				
	A. YES		B. NO		
	JHS	HS	JHS	JHS	HS
149. Students and counselors use <b>computer programs</b> (electronic portfolios) to manage SEOP information.	22%	33%	78%		67%
150. Counselors <b>can document</b> that they spend at least 80% of their time <b>working directly</b> with students.	83%	93%	17%		7%
151. Counselors <b>can document</b> that they spend at least 35% of their time working on the individual planning component of the SEOP.	86%	94%	14%		6%
152. Each counselor has received inservice or training on the SEOP process.	98%	100%	2%		0%
153. The SEOP training we received was effective.	90%	90%	10%		10%
154. Each counselor has learned the necessary skills to carry out his or her SEOP responsibilities.	98%	99%	2%		1%
155. The teamwork approach has helped our counseling department manage its time more effectively.	94%	94%	6%		6%

# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION					
	Junior High School: N = 90				High School: N = 86	
	A. YES		B. NO			
	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS
STUDENT SELF-ASSESSMENT—Students have multiple opportunities to assess their interests, aptitudes, academic, and extracurricular experience.						
The following interest inventories or aptitude tests are administered to students as part of the SEOP process.						
156. DAT	0%	0%	100%	100%		
157. GATB	3%	10%	97%	90%		
158. PLAN	91%	71%	9%	29%		
159. CPS or CPP	33%	63%	68%	37%		
160. SDS	29%	31%	71%	69%		
161. ASVAB	1%	89%	99%	11%		
162. COPS, CAPS, and Copes	48%	41%	53%	59%		
163. Choices	68%	94%	32%	6%		
164. Choices, Jr.	61%	39%	39%	61%		
165. Harrington-O'Shea	3%	1%	97%	99%		
166. Kuder	1%	1%	99%	99%		
167. Strong-Campbell	1%	7%	99%	93%		
168. Assessments of learning styles	27%	24%	73%	76%		
169. Other	65%	64%	35%	36%		

# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION									
		Junior High School: N = 90					High School: N = 86				
		A. 95-100%		B. 90-94%		C. 80-89%		D. 70-79%		E. LESS THAN 70%	
		JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS
PARENT AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT—Parents, community organizations and businesses are actively involved in all stages of the SEOP process and are kept informed of SEOP goals, activities, and products.											
Please refer to your SEOP conference documentation to answer the following questions. Record the percentage of parents that attended SEOP conferences:											
During the 1995-6 school year:											
170. 7 <sup>th</sup> grade	2.66	2.83	16%	17%	19%	17%	16%	33%	12%	0%	37%
171. 8 <sup>th</sup> grade	2.96	2.71	18%	0%	23%	29%	20%	43%	15%	0%	24%
172. 9 <sup>th</sup> grade	2.83	3.07	21%	33%	16%	10%	24%	13%	5%	17%	34%
173. 10 <sup>th</sup> grade	NA	2.71	NA	20%	NA	13%	NA	19%	NA	13%	NA
174. 11 <sup>th</sup> grade	NA	2.70	NA	18%	NA	18%	NA	18%	NA	12%	NA
175. 12 <sup>th</sup> grade	NA	2.70	NA	23%	NA	11%	NA	15%	NA	14%	NA
											37%
											29%
											27%
											35%
											35%
											37%

# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION									
		Junior High School: N = 90					High School: N = 86				
		A. 95-100%		B. 90-94%		C. 80-89%		D. 70-79%		E. LESS THAN 70%	
		JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS
<b>During the 1996-7 school year:</b>											
176. 7 <sup>th</sup> grade	2.81	18%	33%	19%	33%	20%	11%	14%	22%	30%	0%
177. 8 <sup>th</sup> grade	3.23	21%	27%	25%	55%	23%	9%	16%	9%	15%	0%
178. 9 <sup>th</sup> grade	3.07	22%	36%	25%	21%	17%	9%	12%	15%	25%	18%
179. 10 <sup>th</sup> grade	NA	NA	20%	NA	25%	NA	12%	NA	16%	NA	27%
180. 11 <sup>th</sup> grade	NA	NA	15%	NA	27%	NA	18%	NA	11%	NA	30%
181. 12 <sup>th</sup> grade	NA	NA	22%	NA	20%	NA	14%	NA	12%	NA	32%
<b>STUDENT PLANNING—Students create specific education and occupation plans designed to help them attain their stated goals.</b>											
<b>Please refer to your SEOP conference documentation to answer the following questions. Record the percentage of students that attended an INDIVIDUAL SEOP conference:</b>											
<b>During the 1995-6 school year:</b>											
182. 7 <sup>th</sup> grade	3.03	35%	43%	16%	43%	5%	0%	6%	0%	38%	14%
183. 8 <sup>th</sup> grade	3.72	49%	25%	15%	38%	15%	13%	4%	0%	18%	25%
184. 9 <sup>th</sup> grade	3.56	50%	48%	12%	19%	10%	10%	2%	13%	27%	10%
185. 10 <sup>th</sup> grade	NA	NA	42%	NA	14%	NA	16%	NA	12%	NA	15%
186. 11 <sup>th</sup> grade	NA	NA	41%	NA	15%	NA	14%	NA	13%	NA	17%
187. 12 <sup>th</sup> grade	NA	NA	54%	NA	15%	NA	8%	NA	8%	NA	14%

# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION									
		Junior High School: N = 90					High School: N = 86				
		A. 95-100%		B. 90-94%		C. 80-89%	D. 70-79%		E. LESS THAN 70%		
		(5)		(4)		(3)	(2)		(1)		
		JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS
<b>During the 1996-7 school year:</b>											
188. 7 <sup>th</sup> grade	3.75	4.25	51%	38%	14%	50%	10%	13%	8%	0%	17%
189. 8 <sup>th</sup> grade	4.05	4.22	54%	33%	19%	56%	11%	11%	11%	0%	5%
190. 9 <sup>th</sup> grade	3.97	3.91	56%	48%	18%	24%	7%	9%	7%	13%	12%
191. 10 <sup>th</sup> grade	NA	3.70	NA	45%	NA	17%	NA	13%	NA	12%	12%
192. 11 <sup>th</sup> grade	NA	3.76	NA	47%	NA	17%	NA	13%	NA	9%	13%
193. 12 <sup>th</sup> grade	NA	4.00	NA	58%	NA	14%	NA	11%	NA	4%	13%
<b>Please refer to your SEOP conference documentation to answer the following questions.</b>											
<b>Record the percentage of students that attended a SMALL GROUP SEOP conference during the 1996-7 school year:</b>											
194. 7 <sup>th</sup> grade	4.23	2.90	67%	40%	11%	10%	10%	0%	3%	0%	10%
195. 8 <sup>th</sup> grade	4.27	2.90	69%	40%	12%	10%	5%	0%	3%	0%	11%
196. 9 <sup>th</sup> grade	4.48	3.88	75%	68%	11%	0%	6%	9%	3%	0%	5%
197. 10 <sup>th</sup> grade	NA	3.88	NA	52%	NA	19%	NA	10%	NA	1%	NA
198. 11 <sup>th</sup> grade	NA	3.82	NA	49%	NA	18%	NA	13%	NA	4%	NA
199. 12 <sup>th</sup> grade	NA	3.89	NA	54%	NA	16%	NA	11%	NA	3%	NA



# COUNSELOR SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION						
		Junior High School: N = 90					High School: N = 86	
		A. 95-100% (5)	B. 90-94% (4)	C. 80-89% (3)	D. 70-79% (2)	E. LESS THAN 70% (1)		
200. Record the percentage of students planning post-secondary education or training.	JHS 3.50 HS 2.91	JHS 29% HS 9%	JHS 23% HS 19%	JHS 27% HS 40%	JHS 12% HS 17%	JHS 10% HS 15%		
201. Percentage of students who have completed a formalized SEOP.	4.34	64%	18%	10%	4%	4%	3%	
202. Percentage of students who pursue a high school schedule that is consistent with career goals and prepares them for post high school training and/or a job.	3.73	29%	38%	17%	10%	6%	4%	
203. Record the percentage of students whose school-to-careers activities (e.g., apprenticeships, job shadowing, cooperative work experiences) are directly linked to their career goals.	2.40	13%	26%	20%	7%	47%	25%	

## **APPENDIX E**

### **COMPREHENSIVE GUIDANCE PROGRAM**

#### **PRINCIPAL SURVEY RESULTS**





## PRINCIPAL SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION									
		Junior High School: N = 88					High School: N = 85				
		A. EXTREMELY ACCURATE (5)		B. VERY ACCURATE (4)		C. REASONABLY ACCURATE (3)		D. NOT VERY ACCURATE (2)		E. NOT AT ALL ACCURATE (1)	
		JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS
1. A district policy exists that precisely outlines the SEOP process.	4.28	4.28	4.26	59%	55%	19%	26%	14%	12%	7%	5%
2. An SEOP policy statement, based on district policy, has been created at my school.	4.37	4.60	4.60	61%	72%	24%	20%	9%	5%	2%	4%
3. Memos about SEOP activities are provided to all teachers.	4.41	4.39	4.39	60%	59%	21%	27%	17%	9%	1%	4%
4. Teachers receive inservice or training on the SEOP process.	4.11	4.20	4.20	45%	50%	30%	26%	18%	20%	6%	1%
5. Teachers are carefully selected and trained when used as advisors in the SEOP process.	4.16	4.12	4.12	57%	45%	21%	32%	11%	17%	5%	3%
6. Information about the SEOP process is presented to parents at school meetings (e.g., PTA, Orientation, Back-to-School Night).	4.36	4.48	4.48	58%	62%	24%	26%	16%	9%	2%	2%
<b>As principal, I :</b>											
7. Organize special faculty meetings on the SEOP process.	3.98	3.75	3.75	47%	31%	26%	34%	12%	18%	12%	5%
8. Require inservice on the SEOP process.	3.69	3.74	3.74	33%	32%	30%	29%	16%	24%	15%	6%
9. Ensure that school goals related to the SEOP process are created and actively supported.	4.34	4.21	4.21	55%	44%	29%	36%	13%	18%	2%	0%
10. Participate in an active role in the SEOP process.	4.13	4.29	4.29	50%	51%	27%	35%	13%	8%	7%	3%

## PRINCIPAL SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION					
		Junior High School: N = 90					High School: N = 86
		A. EXTREMELY ACCURATE (5)	B. VERY ACCURATE (4)	C. REASONABLY ACCURATE (3)	D. NOT VERY ACCURATE (2)	E. NOT AT ALL ACCURATE (1)	
	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	JHS HS	
11. Hold counselors responsible for following school and district policy concerning the SEOP process.	4.81	83%	15%	2%	0%	0%	
12. Foster community involvement in the SEOP process.	4.16	47%	32%	15%	5%	2%	
13. Work to improve student and community support for the SEOP process.	4.19	49%	27%	19%	3%	1%	
14. Recruit local businesses to provide opportunities (career learning experiences) for students.	3.39	21%	33%	20%	15%	11%	
Community members help develop and improve the SEOP process by:							
15. Donating money for career development activities and programs.	2.56	12%	11%	20%	38%	20%	
16. Donating time to schools for career development activities.	3.70	30%	29%	38%	9%	5%	
17. Donating computer programs, written material, or other resources for career development.	3.05	15%	21%	17%	25%	10%	
18. As principal, I meet with school counselors to establish a budget that will support the Comprehensive Guidance Program and related materials.	4.27	58%	20%	12%	5%	2%	

# PRINCIPAL SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION											
		Junior High School: N = 90					High School: N = 86						
		A. EXTREMELY ACCURATE (5)		B. VERY ACCURATE (4)		C. REASONABLY ACCURATE (3)		D. NOT VERY ACCURATE (2)		E. NOT AT ALL ACCURATE (1)			
	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	
19. At my school, an adequate career center exists that helps introduce students to a wide range of career choices.	3.52		4.26	31%	56%	20%	24%	24%	13%	21%	4%	5%	4%
20. The SEOP process is coordinated (e.g., products are shared and jointly developed, activities are coordinated) with schools in our feeder system	3.94		4.32	43%	54%	27%	29%	15%	12%	12%	5%	3%	0%
The district keeps me informed about:													
21. Resources available for the Comprehensive Guidance Program.	4.14		4.00	48%	39%	26%	32%	20%	20%	3%	9%	2%	0%
22. Budget requirements of the Comprehensive Guidance Program.	4.09		4.16	47%	42%	28%	30%	16%	13%	6%	5%	3%	1%
21. The district gives direction on the use of Comprehensive Guidance funds.	3.99		3.99	36%	36%	36%	38%	22%	19%	6%	4%	1%	4%
22. All students meet <b>individually</b> with an advisor or counselor <b>every year</b> .	4.57		4.69	70%	76%	20%	20%	6%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%
23. Students are exposed to a wide range of career options as part of the guidance curriculum and SEOP conference.	4.49		4.53	60%	60%	28%	34%	11%	5%	0%	1%	0%	0%
24. Classes dedicated solely to career exploration or life skills exist.	4.10		4.02	56%	55%	18%	20%	10%	6%	9%	7%	6%	11%

## PRINCIPAL SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)		PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION							
			Junior High School: N = 90				High School: N = 86			
			A. EXTREMELY ACCURATE (5)	B. VERY ACCURATE (4)	C. REASONABLY ACCURATE (3)	D. NOT VERY ACCURATE (2)	E. NOT AT ALL ACCURATE (1)			
	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS
27. School-to-careers initiatives (e.g., registered apprenticeships, tech prep, academy programs, internships) are linked to students' SEOP goals.	3.23	4.31	17%	49%	26%	14%	17%	2%	12%	0%
28. As a result of the Comprehensive Guidance Program, more students are taking <b>higher level</b> math, science, and writing classes.	3.15	3.59	7%	20%	45%	34%	15%	10%	5%	2%
29. As a result of the Comprehensive Guidance Program, more students are taking Applied Technology Education classes.	3.36	3.78	15%	28%	39%	31%	12%	7%	5%	1%
30. All students develop a formalized four- or five-year SEOP.	4.62	4.47	71%	59%	10%	9%	0%	1%	0%	0%
31. Students formally revise and extend their SEOP <b>every year</b> .	4.52	4.61	67%	66%	8%	5%	3%	0%	0%	0%
32. In my school, teachers are trained to understand their SEOP role.	4.02	3.96	40%	28%	18%	22%	6%	1%	2%	2%
33. As principal, I assume responsibility for the overall success of the Comprehensive Guidance Program at my school.	4.38	4.32	57%	46%	7%	12%	5%	1%	1%	0%
34. With respect to the SEOP process, I make certain that counselors are implementing district policy and state law at my school.	4.67	4.47	74%	55%	3%	8%	0%	0%	1%	0%



# PRINCIPAL SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)		PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION									
			Junior High School: N-90					High School: N-86				
	JHS	HS	A. EXTENSIVE (5)		B. MORE THAN ADEQUATE (4)		C. ADEQUATE (3)		D. SOMEWHAT LIMITED (2)		E. VERY LIMITED (1)	
	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS
<b>Rate the extent of DISTRICT-LEVEL SUPPORT for the SEOP process and products in the following areas:</b>												
35. Development of guidance curriculum.	3.85	3.71	30%	25%	30%	36%	38%	27%	3%	8%	0%	4%
36. Inservice assistance.	3.86	3.82	29%	27%	33%	39%	33%	26%	5%	6%	0%	2%
37. Modifying programs, course offerings, and curriculum to meet student needs.	3.59	3.76	19%	28%	33%	31%	38%	32%	10%	8%	0%	1%
38. Coordination (both vertical and horizontal) among schools.	3.62	3.69	22%	25%	31%	33%	36%	31%	10%	11%	1%	1%
39. Articulation of the SEOP process.	3.97	3.87	33%	25%	35%	45%	28%	25%	2%	5%	1%	1%
40. Providing leadership on the Comprehensive Guidance Program.	4.30	4.00	35%	36%	39%	37%	22%	21%	3%	4%	1%	2%

# PRINCIPAL SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)		PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION									
			Junior High School: N = 90					High School: N = 86				
			A. INCREASED DRAMATICALLY (5)	B. INCREASED STEADILY (4)	C. INCREASED SLIGHTLY (3)	D. REMAINED THE SAME (2)	E. DECREASED (1)	A. INCREASED DRAMATICALLY (5)	B. INCREASED STEADILY (4)	C. INCREASED SLIGHTLY (3)	D. REMAINED THE SAME (2)	E. DECREASED (1)
Over the past several years:												
41. Parent involvement in the SEOP process has . . .	4.30	4.20	40%	53%	54%	5%	9%	1%	2%	1%	0%	
42. Teacher support of the SEOP process has . . .	3.78	3.79	10%	68%	68%	13%	15%	8%	6%	1%	1%	
43. The amount of time devoted to guidance activities has . . .	4.36	4.33	47%	45%	47%	5%	8%	3%	1%	0%	0%	
44. The amount of counselor time and resources devoted to SEOP activities has . . .	4.61	4.48	69%	25%	33%	5%	4%	0%	2%	1%	1%	

**APPENDIX F**

**COMPREHENSIVE GUIDANCE PROGRAM**

**TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS**





## TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION							
		Junior High School: N = 255				High School: N = 241			
		A. EXTREMELY ACCURATE (5)	B. VERY ACCURATE (4)	C. REASONABLY ACCURATE (3)	D. NOT VERY ACCURATE (2)	E. NOT AT ALL ACCURATE (1)			
		JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	JHS	HS
1. Teachers receive memos about SEOP activities.	JHS 3.86 HS 3.88	38%	35%	20%	21%	6%	5%	6%	5%
2. The administration ensures that school goals related to the SEOP process are created and supported.	JHS 3.94 HS 3.93	35%	28%	24%	21%	5%	5%	2%	1%
3. Teachers support school goals related to the SEOP process.	JHS 3.73 HS 3.68	21%	18%	34%	34%	6%	6%	1%	1%
4. Teachers are carefully selected and trained when used as advisors in the SEOP process.	JHS 3.51 HS 3.24	27%	18%	28%	32%	11%	16%	8%	10%
5. Inservice or training on the SEOP process is provided for <b>all</b> teachers.	JHS 2.98 HS 3.15	20%	22%	16%	24%	20%	20%	22%	14%
6. Teachers have access to the SEOP goals of their students.	JHS 3.53 HS 3.79	31%	39%	22%	23%	16%	9%	8%	6%
7. Students in my classes know which career area they have selected without having to look it up in their SEOP folder.	JHS 3.13 HS 3.33	11%	10%	39%	45%	16%	11%	9%	3%
8. Teachers modify planned learning activities based on the SEOP goals of students in their classroom.	JHS 2.38 HS 2.50	3%	4%	26%	33%	37%	36%	22%	16%
9. At my school, an adequate career center exists that helps introduce students to a wide range of career choices.	JHS 3.22 HS 4.12	28%	47%	21%	17%	18%	7%	16%	2%
10. Teachers receive an orientation to the career center.	JHS 2.37 HS 2.83	9%	14%	20%	29%	27%	24%	33%	18%

# TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	MEAN (Based on Scale at Right)	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION						
		Junior High School: N = 90			High School: N = 86			
		A. EXTREMELY ACCURATE (5)	B. VERY ACCURATE (4)	C. REASONABLY ACCURATE (3)	D. NOT VERY ACCURATE (2)	E. NOT AT ALL ACCURATE (1)		
11. The career center at my school is highly accessible and available to students and teachers.	JHS 3.04 HS 4.11	JHS 24% HS 50%	JHS 16% HS 23%	JHS 20% HS 18%	JHS 20% HS 6%	JHS 20% HS 3%		
12. Teachers use the career center and other resources (e.g., videos, computer software, print material) for regular classroom instruction.	2.62 3.06	9% 11%	16% 21%	26% 39%	25% 22%	24% 8%		
13. Teachers infuse career exploration into their regular curriculum.	3.28 3.34	12% 13%	30% 24%	38% 48%	15% 14%	6% 1%		
14. Teachers are given sufficient time to carry out assigned SEOP duties.	3.36 3.34	21% 17%	25% 31%	32% 30%	14% 13%	8% 9%		

# TEACHER SURVEY RESULTS

ITEM	PERCENTAGE MARKING EACH OPTION				
	Junior High School: N = 90		High School: N = 86		
	A. YES		B. NO		
	JHS	HS	JHS	HS	
15. I am familiar with the SEOP process at my school.	78%	81%	21%	19%	
16. I am involved as an advisor or instructor in the SEOP process.	47%	50%	52%	50%	
17. I have received inservice or training on the SEOP process.	55%	63%	44%	38%	
18. The SEOP training I received was effective.	62%	60%	37%	39%	
19. I have learned the necessary skills to carry out my SEOP responsibilities.	63%	62%	37%	38%	
20. I am given enough time for my SEOP responsibilities.	57%	54%	42%	46%	
21. As a result of the Comprehensive Guidance Program, more class time has been devoted to guidance activities.	51%	47%	48%	52%	
22. Students use their SEOP information or portfolios in my class.	28%	34%	71%	66%	
23. All students in my school develop a formalized four- or five-year SEOP.	74%	78%	25%	22%	
24. All students in my school select a career area as part of the SEOP process.	76%	81%	24%	19%	



## **STUDY II**

---

# **CONTRASTS BETWEEN STUDENTS IN HIGH IMPLEMENTATION AND LOW IMPLEMENTATION HIGH SCHOOLS IN THE UTAH COMPREHENSIVE GUIDANCE PROGRAM**

---

### ***Prepared for:***

The Utah State Office of Education  
Scott W. Bean, State Superintendent of Public Education  
Robert O. Brems, Associate Superintendent, Applied Technology Education  
R. Lynn Jensen, Coordinator, Integrated Curriculum and Student Services  
Judy Peterson, Specialist, Comprehensive Guidance

### ***Prepared by:***

IBRIC  
The Institute for Behavioral Research in Creativity  
David E. Nelson, Senior Research Scientist  
David G. Fox, Senior Research Scientist  
John L. Gardner, Project Manager

### ***By:***

David E. Nelson, John L. Gardner, and David G. Fox

March, 1998

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
METHOD.....	1
RESULTS.....	2
TABLE 1: Description of High and Low Implementation High School Samples .....	4
TABLE 2: Students' Evaluation of High School Preparation "How well did this school prepare you for a job? .....	5
TABLE 3: Students' Evaluation of High School Preparation "How well did this school prepare you for continuing your education?.....	6
TABLE 4: Students' Description of their High School Programs .....	7
TABLE 5: Enrollment in Specific Courses .....	8
TABLE 6: Enrollment of Females in Mathematics and Science Courses .....	9
TABLE 7: Percentage of Students Who Have Taken Either One or Two Vocational/Technical Courses .....	10
TABLE 8: Average ACT scores of Students in High Implementing vs. Low Implementing High Schools .....	11
TABLE 9: Students' Evaluations of Guidance and Career Education Services in High Implementation vs. Low Implementation High .....	12
CONCLUSIONS .....	13





## **INTRODUCTION**

In addition to the survey approach described in study I of this evaluation, the authors felt it was important to look at the impact of the Comprehensive Guidance Program on important student outcomes and characteristics. This objective was accomplished through the analysis of two databases managed by the Evaluation and Assessment Section of the Utah State Office of Education. These databases are the annual Survey of the Intentions and Accomplishments of Utah High School Seniors and the statewide ACT database which is furnished to the state annually by the American College Testing Program. The availability of these data made it possible to examine the impact of levels of implementation of the Utah Comprehensive Guidance Program on student outcomes.

## **METHOD**

The key evaluation question for this phase of the overall study was: "What impact does the level of implementation of the Comprehensive Guidance program have on important descriptors of student success and other characteristics?" The authors developed a level of implementation scale using key items from the counselor, administrator, and teacher survey forms. A composite score on these key items was computed for every school in the sample and a rank-ordered distribution of scores prepared. From the total of nearly 100 high schools, a matched set of high implementation and low implementation high schools was selected. Table 1 describes the characteristics of the two samples in terms of school location, percentage of students receiving free lunch, and the size of the grade 11 classes in each school. Clearly, the two samples are highly similar on the matching variables, thus eliminating the effects of these demographic variables in explaining any findings of differences between the two groups of schools.



## RESULTS

Tables 2 through 7 present results from Utah's annual Survey of the Intentions and Accomplishments of High School Seniors. All of the results are for data gathered in the Spring of 1997. **Tables 2 and 3 show that students in high implementations schools were more positive than their peers in the low implementation sample in evaluating how well their school prepared them for a job and for continuing their education.**

Some 79% of the high implementation sample students felt they were adequately or better prepared for a job, in contrast with 75% of the low implementation group.

Differences were somewhat more marked on the education preparation item. Table 3 shows that 44% of the students in the high implementation sample rated their preparation as either "very good" or "more than adequate." This was in contrast to 37% in the low implementation sample.

An analysis of statistical significance using chi-square showed the differences in both tables to be significant beyond the .05 level.

Table 4 examines how students described their high school programs. A major problem in the state of Utah over a very long period of time is the percentage of high school students who characterize their high school program as "general." **This study revealed that substantially fewer students in the high implementation sample described their high school program as "general."** The difference here is 48% for the high implementation sample versus 55% for the low implementation sample. This area would appear to be a particularly crucial test for the Comprehensive Guidance program if it is effective in helping students target areas of educational/career emphasis. The differences reported in Table 4 were also analyzed using chi-square and are significant beyond the .01 level.

Table 5 depicts the **enrollment of students** in high and low implementation schools in numerous specific courses. This set of contrasts features the **typical high school math courses, frequently taken science courses, and several Advanced Placement course areas.** Given the relationship between patterns of course taking and later student success in post-secondary training and careers, these contrasts are another important area for examination of the possible impact of the implementation of

Comprehensive Guidance. **Table 5 shows that while none of the differences are profound, they are systematically in favor of the high implementation sample.** This is particularly true in the typical math sequence with the exception of advanced algebra. The same pattern can be seen in the percentage of students taking biology, chemistry, and physics. Enrollment in the Advanced Placement courses is much more nearly equal for the two samples.

Table 6 features results from an analysis of the **percentage of females taking typical mathematics and science courses.** Again, results are consistently in favor of students in the high implementation schools with the most profound differences being in the areas of trigonometry and chemistry.

Table 7 presents the percentage of the students who have taken either one or two vocational/technical courses for the two samples. **These results show consistent differences favoring the high implementation schools in virtually every vocational/technical course area.** The most marked differences are for business courses, cooperative work experience, and industrial arts.

Tables 8 and 9 present results from the ACT database. Results in both of these tables are for students who were in the graduating class of 1997. Table 8 profiles mean ACT scores for students in the high implementation sample and the low implementation sample. **Differences here are quite remarkable in favoring the high implementation schools.** The high implementation group scores higher on all five ACT scales and each of these differences is statistically significant beyond the .01 level. It is also instructive to note that the high implementation schools outscore the total state of Utah by some margin and that the state outcores the nation in every area of the ACT.

Table 9 presents **students' evaluations of guidance and career education services** in the high implementation and low implementation high schools. Among the students who characterized themselves as "completely satisfied" with the two service areas, a substantially higher percentage is reported by students in the high implementation group. Among those students who described themselves as "dissatisfied," higher percentages were found in the low implementation sample. Both these overall sets of ratings were significant at the levels indicated in table 9.

**TABLE 1****DESCRIPTION OF HIGH AND LOW IMPLEMENTATION  
HIGH SCHOOL SAMPLES**

<b>SAMPLE DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>HIGH IMPLEMENTATION SAMPLE</b>	<b>LOW IMPLEMENTATION SAMPLE</b>
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF SCHOOLS</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>NUMBER OF RURAL SCHOOLS</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>NUMBER OF URBAN/SUBURBAN SCHOOLS</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>MEDIAN PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS RECEIVING FREE LUNCH</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>MEDIAN NUMBER OF GRADE 11 STUDENTS</b>	<b>376</b>	<b>386</b>

**TABLE 2****STUDENTS' EVALUATIONS OF HIGH SCHOOL PREPARATION****"HOW WELL DID THIS SCHOOL PREPARE YOU FOR A JOB?"**

<b>SCALE</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MARKING EACH OPTION</b>	
	<b>High Implementation Schools N=1,477</b>	<b>Low Implementation Schools N=1,508</b>
<b>VERY WELL</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>MORE THAN ADEQUATELY</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>16%</b>
<b>ADEQUATELY</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>50%</b>
<b>LESS THAN ADEQUATELY</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>VERY POORLY</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>5%</b>
<b>NOT SURE</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>7%</b>



**TABLE 3****STUDENTS' EVALUATIONS OF HIGH SCHOOL PREPARATION****"HOW WELL DID THIS SCHOOL PREPARE YOU FOR CONTINUING  
YOUR EDUCATION?"**

<b>SCALE</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MARKING EACH OPTION</b>	
	<b>High Implementation Schools N=1,477</b>	<b>Low Implementation Schools N=1,508</b>
<b>VERY WELL</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>17%</b>
<b>MORE THAN ADEQUATELY</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>20%</b>
<b>ADEQUATELY</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>48%</b>
<b>LESS THAN ADEQUATELY</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>VERY POORLY</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3%</b>
<b>NOT SURE</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>5%</b>

**TABLE 4****STUDENTS' DESCRIPTIONS OF THEIR  
HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAMS**

<b>PROGRAM</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MARKING EACH OPTION</b>	
	<b>High Implementation Schools N=1,477</b>	<b>Low Implementation Schools N=1,508</b>
<b>COLLEGE PREP</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>37%</b>
<b>APPLIED TECHNOLOGY (VOCATIONAL- TECHNICAL)</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>8%</b>
<b>GENERAL</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>55%</b>

**TABLE 5**

**ENROLLMENT IN SPECIFIC COURSES**

COURSE	PERCENTAGE TAKING EACH COURSE	
	High Implementation Schools N=1,477	Low Implementation Schools N=1,508
ALGEBRA I (1ST YEAR) .....	88%	85%
ALGEBRA II (2ND YEAR) .....	77%	74%
ADVANCED ALGEBRA .....	39%	42%
GEOMETRY .....	78%	75%
TRIGONOMETRY .....	45%	40%
APPLIED MATH I .....	14%	14%
APPLIED MATH II .....	8%	10%
BIOLOGY .....	91%	89%
CHEMISTRY .....	55%	50%
PHYSICS .....	29%	28%
COMPUTER RELATED COURSE .....	67%	71%
ADVANCED PLACEMENT HISTORY/ GOVERNMENT/ECONOMICS .....	31%	31%
ADVANCED PLACEMENT ENGLISH .....	29%	27%
ADVANCED PLACEMENT MATHEMATICS/CALCULUS .....	18%	18%
ADVANCED PLACEMENT SCIENCE .....	17%	18%
ADVANCED PLACEMENT FOREIGN LANGUAGE .....	9%	9%
ADVANCED PLACEMENT ARTS OR MUSIC .....	19%	16%
ADVANCED PLACEMENT COMPUTER SCIENCE .....	4%	6%

**TABLE 6****ENROLLMENT OF FEMALES IN  
MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE COURSES**

<b>COURSE</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MARKING EACH OPTION</b>	
	<b>High Implementation Schools N=736</b>	<b>Low Implementation Schools N=706</b>
<b>ALGEBRA I (1ST YEAR) .....</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>87%</b>
<b>ALGEBRA II (2ND YEAR) .....</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>76%</b>
<b>ADVANCED ALGEBRA .....</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>44%</b>
<b>GEOMETRY .....</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>77%</b>
<b>TRIGONOMETRY .....</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>41%</b>
<b>APPLIED MATH I .....</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>APPLIED MATH II .....</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>9%</b>
<b>BIOLOGY .....</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>90%</b>
<b>CHEMISTRY .....</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>54%</b>
<b>PHYSICS .....</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>24%</b>

**TABLE 7****PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WHO HAVE TAKEN EITHER  
ONE OR TWO VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL COURSES**

<b>COURSE</b>	<b>HIGH IMPLEMENTATION SCHOOLS</b>	<b>LOW IMPLEMENTATION SCHOOLS</b>
	<b>N=1,477</b>	<b>N=1,508</b>
<b>AGRICULTURE .....</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>13%</b>
<b>BUSINESS .....</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>56%</b>
<b>HEALTH OCCUPATIONS .....</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>51%</b>
<b>HOME ECONOMICS .....</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>47%</b>
<b>INDUSTRIAL ARTS .....</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>35%</b>
<b>MARKETING .....</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>21%</b>
<b>COOPERATIVE WORK EXPERIENCE. ...</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>25%</b>

**TABLE 8**

**AVERAGE ACT SCORES OF STUDENTS IN  
HIGH IMPLEMENTING VS. LOW IMPLEMENTING  
HIGH SCHOOLS**

SCALE	MEAN ACT SCALE SCORES - 1997			
	HIGH IMPLEMENTATION SCHOOLS  N=1,668	LOW IMPLEMENTATION SCHOOLS  N=1,625	TOTAL STATE  N=22,295	NATION  N=959,301
MATHEMATICS	21.3 <sup>a</sup>	20.9	20.8	20.6
READING	22.3	21.7	22.0	21.3
ENGLISH	21.5	20.8	21.1	20.3
SCIENCE REASONING	21.8	21.4	21.6	21.1
COMPOSITE	21.9	21.3	21.5	21.0

<sup>a</sup> All differences are statistically significant ( $p < .01$ )  
in favor of high implementation high schools

**TABLE 9**

**STUDENTS' EVALUATIONS OF GUIDANCE AND  
CAREER EDUCATION SERVICES IN  
HIGH IMPLEMENTATION VS. LOW IMPLEMENTATION  
HIGH SCHOOLS  
N= 22,295**

Service	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS WHO ARE:					
	"COMPLETELY SATISFIED"		"GENERALLY SATISFIED"		"DISSATISFIED"	
	High Implementation	Low Implementation	High Implementation	Low Implementation	High Implementation	Low Implementation
<b>GUIDANCE SERVICES <sup>a</sup></b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>19%</b>
<b>CAREER EDUCATION <sup>b</sup> AND PLANNING SERVICES</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>15%</b>

<sup>a</sup> Student ratings are statistically significant favoring high implementation schools ( $p < .01$ )

<sup>b</sup> Student ratings are statistically significant favoring high implementation schools ( $p < .07$ )



## CONCLUSIONS

An overall analysis of the information presented in this section of the report suggests a pattern of meaningful and statistically significant differences which favors the sample of seven high schools in the high implementation group. While it is important to note that this evaluation design cannot rule out the influence of unmeasured variables on these results, it is also highly probable, given the equality of the two samples on important demographics, that the influence of Comprehensive Guidance is real in impacting important student outcomes and other characteristics.

The following are the major specific conclusions from this study:

- Students in high implementing schools rated their overall **educational preparation** as more adequate.
- Students in high implementing schools rated their **job preparation** as better.
- Students in high implementing schools **took more advanced mathematics and science courses**.
- **Fewer** students in high implementing schools described their program as “general.”
- Students in high implementing schools **took more vocational/technical courses**.
- Students in high implementing schools had **higher ACT scores in every area** of the test.
- Students in high implementing schools **rated guidance and career planning services in the schools higher**.

## **Study II**

### **APPENDIX A**

#### **Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program High Implementing High Schools**



## APPENDIX A

### Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program High Implementing High Schools

Source: Intentions and Accomplishments  
of Utah High School Seniors: 1997

A. SEX		
	STUDENTS RESPONDING	
	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
MALE	740	50.13
FEMALE	736	49.86

B. ETHNICITY/RACE		
	STUDENTS RESPONDING	
	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE	20	1.37
BLACK-NOT OF HISPANIC ORIGIN	7	.48
WHITE-NOT OF HISPANIC ORIGIN	1,331	91.79
PACIFIC ISLANDER	19	1.31
ASIAN	27	1.86
HISPANIC	46	3.17

C. HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM		
	STUDENTS RESPONDING	
	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
COLLEGE PREP	588	43.68
APPLIED TECH (VOC-TECH)	108	8.02
GENERAL	650	48.29

# APPENDIX A CONTINUED

## Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program High Implementing High Schools

TABLE 2

### EDUCATIONAL AND EMPLOYMENT PLANS

A. EMPLOYMENT			
DO YOU PLAN TO BE EMPLOYED NEXT FALL?	PERCENTAGE OF SENIORS MARKING EACH OPTION		
	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
FULL-TIME	30.15	19.34	24.74
PART-TIME	43.11	64.44	53.78
MILITARY	3.27	.68	1.97
OTHER	8.59	.81	4.70
NO OR UNDECIDED	14.87	14.71	14.79
B. POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION			
ARE YOU PLANNING ON POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION OR TRAINING NEXT FALL?	PERCENTAGE OF SENIORS MARKING EACH OPTION		
	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
FULL-TIME	45.59	67.17	56.31
PART-TIME	23.06	20.60	21.84
NO OR UNDECIDED	31.34	12.22	21.84
C. ENROLLMENT			
DO YOU PLAN TO ENROLL IN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING NEXT FALL?	PERCENTAGE OF SENIORS MARKING EACH OPTION		
	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
4-YEAR COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY	41.16	53.42	47.27
2-YEAR COLLEGE	28.26	35.61	31.92
APPLIED TECHNOLOGY CENTER	4.07	2.32	3.20
OTHER JOB TRAINING	7.06	3.28	5.18
NO PLANS TO ENROLL	19.42	5.34	12.41

# APPENDIX A CONTINUED

## Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program High Implementing High Schools

TABLE 3

### STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF THEIR HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

A. STUDENT RATINGS OF COURSES						
COURSES	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MARKING EACH SCALE POINT					
	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	NO RESPONSE
ENGLISH	31.94	31.06	24.43	7.37	1.97	.20
MATHEMATICS	21.69	27.08	28.78	15.07	5.59	1.77
SOCIAL STUDIES (HISTORY, GOVERNMENT, PSYCHOLOGY, ETC.)	25.18	31.87	28.05	10.98	2.79	1.09
NATURAL SCIENCES (BIOLOGY, CHEMISTRY, PHYSICS, ETC.)	20.12	29.84	31.00	12.79	4.24	1.98
FOREIGN LANGUAGES	11.03	16.27	24.55	16.75	8.82	22.55
FINE ARTS (MUSIC, ART, ETC.)	30.63	23.50	21.04	10.82	3.70	10.28
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	23.91	23.57	30.85	13.19	4.32	4.12
APPLIED TECHNOLOGY (HOME ECONOMICS, INDUSTRIAL ARTS, BUSINESS, ETC.)	19.47	23.68	24.51	9.25	2.90	20.16
OTHER COURSES	23.05	22.54	31.33	5.83	1.55	15.66

B. OVERALL EVALUATION OF HIGH SCHOOL PREPARATION			
HOW WELL DID THIS HIGH SCHOOL PREPARE YOU FOR A JOB?	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MARKING EACH SCALE POINT	HOW WELL DID THIS HIGH SCHOOL PREPARE YOU FOR CONTINUING YOUR EDUCATION?	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MARKING EACH SCALE POINT
VERY WELL	11.32	VERY WELL	19.63
MORE THAN ADEQUATELY	19.25	MORE THAN ADEQUATELY	23.83
ADEQUATELY	48.48	ADEQUATELY	44.27
LESS THAN ADEQUATELY	10.12	LESS THAN ADEQUATELY	5.41
VERY POORLY	4.22	VERY POORLY	2.43
NO OPINION/NOT SURE	6.57	NO OPINION/NOT SURE	4.40

## APPENDIX A CONTINUED

### Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program High Implementing High Schools

TABLE 4

#### SUBJECT AREA ENROLLMENT FOR ALL SENIORS RESPONDING

SUBJECT AREA IN GRADES 9-12	PERCENTAGE OF SENIORS WHO HAVE TAKEN AT LEAST		
	2 YEARS	3 YEARS	4 YEARS +
1. ENGLISH OR LITERATURE	98.91	98.37	88.82
2. FOREIGN LANGUAGE	57.68	15.50	4.53
3. HISTORY OR SOCIAL STUDIES	95.32	71.15	18.88
4. MATHEMATICS	97.76	75.76	41.23
5. SCIENCE	93.97	58.29	19.83
6. ART	46.30	23.69	11.84
7. MUSIC	30.12	18.61	12.25
8. PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND HEALTH	75.08	40.41	20.85



## APPENDIX A CONTINUED

### Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program High Implementing High Schools

TABLE 5

#### ENROLLMENT IN SPECIFIC COURSES FOR ALL SENIORS RESPONDING

COURSE	PERCENTAGE TAKING EACH COURSE
1. ALGEBRA I (1ST YEAR)	88.15
2. ALGEBRA II (2ND YEAR)	76.57
3. ADVANCED ALGEBRA	38.65
4. GEOMETRY	78.33
5. TRIGONOMETRY	45.29
6. APPLIED MATH I	14.08
7. APPLIED MATH II	7.65
8. BIOLOGY	90.92
9. CHEMISTRY	54.97
10. PHYSICS	29.11
11. COMPUTER RELATED COURSE	67.43
12. ADVANCED PLACEMENT HISTORY/ GOVERNMENT/ECONOMICS	31.14
13. ADVANCED PLACEMENT ENGLISH	29.04
14. ADVANCED PLACEMENT MATHEMATICS/CALCULUS	17.60
15. ADVANCED PLACEMENT SCIENCE	16.58
16. ADVANCED PLACEMENT FOREIGN LANGUAGE	8.59
17. ADVANCED PLACEMENT ARTS OR MUSIC	19.63
18. ADVANCED PLACEMENT COMPUTER SCIENCE	3.92

## APPENDIX A CONTINUED

### Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program High Implementing High Schools

TABLE 6

#### SUBJECT AREA ENROLLMENT FOR MALES AND FEMALES

SUBJECT AREA IN GRADES 9-12	PERCENTAGE OF SENIORS WHO HAVE TAKEN AT LEAST:					
	2 YEARS		3 YEARS		4 YEARS +	
	MALES	FEMALES	MALES	FEMALES	MALES	FEMALES
1. ENGLISH OR LITERATURE	98.37	99.45	97.56	99.18	85.27	92.39
2. FOREIGN LANGUAGE	50.53	64.80	12.83	18.20	3.10	5.97
3. HISTORY OR SOCIAL STUDIES	94.45	96.19	65.94	76.35	16.89	20.92
4. MATHEMATICS	96.62	98.91	74.59	76.90	41.62	40.76
5. SCIENCE	93.24	94.70	56.62	59.91	23.24	16.44
6. ART	47.43	45.24	24.59	22.82	10.67	13.04
7. MUSIC	23.51	36.68	14.72	22.55	9.45	15.08
8. PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND HEALTH	77.16	72.96	44.05	36.82	25.40	16.30

## APPENDIX A CONTINUED

### Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program Hig., Implementing High Schools

TABLE 7

#### ENROLLMENT OF MALES AND FEMALES IN SPECIFIC COURSES

COURSE	PERCENTAGE TAKING EACH COURSE	
	MALES	FEMALES
1. ALGEBRA I (1ST YEAR)	86.48	89.94
2. ALGEBRA II (2ND YEAR)	74.05	79.21
3. ADVANCED ALGEBRA	38.10	39.26
4. GEOMETRY	76.89	79.89
5. TRIGONOMETRY	42.83	47.82
6. APPLIED MATH I	16.08	12.09
7. APPLIED MATH II	8.64	6.65
8. BIOLOGY	89.05	92.93
9. CHEMISTRY	50.94	59.10
10. PHYSICS	35.81	22.28
11. COMPUTER RELATED COURSE	67.56	67.39
12. ADVANCED PLACEMENT HISTORY/ GOVERNMENT/ECONOMICS	26.75	35.59
13. ADVANCED PLACEMENT ENGLISH	20.13	38.04
14. ADVANCED PLACEMENT MATHEMATICS/CALCULUS	17.16	18.07
15. ADVANCED PLACEMENT SCIENCE	16.62	16.57
16. ADVANCED PLACEMENT FOREIGN LANGUAGE	7.43	9.78
17. ADVANCED PLACEMENT ARTS OR MUSIC	18.10	21.19
18. ADVANCED PLACEMENT COMPUTER SCIENCE	5.81	2.03

## APPENDIX A CONTINUED

### Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program High Implementing High Schools

TABLE 8  
**SUBJECT ENROLLMENT FOR SENIORS  
IN SPECIFIC PROGRAM EMPHASIS AREAS**

SUBJECT AREA IN GRADES 9-12	PERCENTAGE TAKING EACH COURSE								
	2 YEARS			3 YEARS			4 YEARS +		
	COLLEGE	VOC/ TECH	GEN	COLLEGE	VOC/ TECH	GEN	COLLEGE	VOC/ TECH	GEN
1. ENGLISH OR LITERATURE	99.65	99.99	98.46	99.65	99.07	97.53	96.08	77.77	85.07
2. FOREIGN LANGUAGE	70.74	37.03	48.61	20.74	7.40	12.46	5.10	1.85	4.61
3. HISTORY OR SOCIAL STUDIES	97.78	95.36	93.69	78.40	62.96	66.92	26.36	10.18	13.84
4. MATHEMATICS	99.48	95.36	97.23	85.54	55.55	70.30	53.74	23.14	33.69
5. SCIENCE	98.12	87.96	91.69	70.57	38.88	51.07	26.36	12.03	15.84
6. ART	40.64	44.44	52.30	19.04	22.22	27.38	9.86	13.88	13.23
7. MUSIC	35.88	24.07	25.69	24.48	14.81	13.99	16.15	8.33	9.84
8. PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND HEALTH	72.95	73.14	77.07	37.92	42.59	41.69	21.42	18.51	19.84

## APPENDIX A CONTINUED

### Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program High Implementing High Schools

TABLE 9

#### ENROLLMENT IN COURSES FOR SENIORS IN SPECIFIC PROGRAM EMPHASIS AREAS

COURSE	PERCENTAGE TAKING EACH COURSE		
	COLLEGE	VOC/TECH	GENERAL
1. ALGEBRA I (1ST YEAR)	89.79	86.11	86.92
2. ALGEBRA II (2ND YEAR)	89.45	69.44	66.92
3. ADVANCED ALGEBRA	53.91	25.00	27.84
4. GEOMETRY	87.41	72.22	70.15
5. TRIGONOMETRY	67.34	29.62	29.69
6. APPLIED MATH I	12.41	16.66	15.53
7. APPLIED MATH II	7.31	9.25	7.53
8. BIOLOGY	95.06	90.74	87.53
9. CHEMISTRY	73.46	35.18	42.76
10. PHYSICS	36.39	25.92	23.38
11. COMPUTER RELATED COURSE	68.02	77.77	66.00
12. ADVANCED PLACEMENT HISTORY/ GOVERNMENT/ECONOMICS	48.46	16.66	18.15
13. ADVANCED PLACEMENT ENGLISH	43.19	12.96	19.23
14. ADVANCED PLACEMENT MATHEMATICS/CALCULUS	31.46	3.70	8.15
15. ADVANCED PLACEMENT SCIENCE	26.87	9.25	8.30
16. ADVANCED PLACEMENT FOREIGN LANGUAGE	11.22	3.70	6.30
17. ADVANCED PLACEMENT ARTS OR MUSIC	21.76	16.66	17.84
18. ADVANCED PLACEMENT COMPUTER SCIENCE	2.38	9.25	4.30

## APPENDIX A CONTINUED

### Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program High Implementing High Schools

TABLE 10

#### ENROLLMENT IN VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL COURSES FOR ALL STUDENTS RESPONDING

COURSE	PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS WHO HAVE TAKEN AT LEAST:			
	NO CLASSES	1-2 CLASSES	3-4 CLASSES	5 OR MORE
1. AGRICULTURE	68.24	13.72	3.30	.60
2. BUSINESS	28.90	59.77	10.96	1.69
3. HEALTH OCCUPATIONS	37.16	48.19	3.65	.81
4. HOME ECONOMICS	38.86	48.19	9.20	1.08
5. INDUSTRIAL ARTS	45.49	40.27	15.29	5.14
6. MARKETING	61.94	20.70	.80	.20
7. COOPERATIVE WORK EXPERIENCE	55.04	29.77	5.00	.88

# APPENDIX A CONTINUED

## Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program High Implementing High Schools

TABLE 11

### ENROLLMENT IN VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL COURSES FOR MALES AND FEMALES

COURSE	PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS WHO HAVE TAKEN AT LEAST:							
	NO CLASSES		1-2 CLASSES		3-4 CLASSES		5 OR MORE	
	MALES	FEMALES	MALES	FEMALES	MALES	FEMALES	MALES	FEMALES
1. AGRICULTURE	64.05	72.55	17.02	10.45	4.59	2.03	1.08	.13
2. BUSINESS	30.94	26.90	56.07	63.58	9.99	11.95	1.21	2.17
3. HEALTH OCCUPATIONS	37.83	36.54	44.85	51.61	2.96	4.33	.94	.67
4. HOME ECONOMICS	46.48	31.25	37.69	58.81	4.45	13.98	.40	1.76
5. INDUSTRIAL ARTS	33.51	57.60	53.49	26.89	23.77	6.65	8.64	1.49
6. MARKETING	58.37	65.62	22.82	18.61	1.34	.27	.40	.00
7. COOPERATIVE WORK EXPERIENCE	53.10	57.06	29.58	30.01	6.75	3.25	.94	.81





## **Study II**

### **APPENDIX B**

#### **Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program Low Implementing High Schools**



## APPENDIX B

### Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program Low Implementing High Schools

Source: Intentions and Accomplishments  
of Utah High School Seniors: 1997

A. SEX		
	STUDENTS RESPONDING	
	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
MALE	800	53.12
FEMALE	706	46.87

  

B. ETHNICITY/RACE		
	STUDENTS RESPONDING	
	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
AMERICAN INDIAN OR ALASKAN NATIVE	46	3.12
BLACK-NOT OF HISPANIC ORIGIN	6	.40
WHITE-NOT OF HISPANIC ORIGIN	1,305	88.77
PACIFIC ISLANDER	29	1.97
ASIAN	26	1.76
HISPANIC	58	3.94

  

C. HIGH SCHOOL PROGRAM		
	STUDENTS RESPONDING	
	NUMBER	PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL
COLLEGE PREP	517	36.69
APPLIED TECH (VOC-TECH)	110	7.80
GENERAL	782	55.50

# APPENDIX B CONTINUED

## Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program Low Implementing High Schools

TABLE 2

### EDUCATIONAL AND EMPLOYMENT PLANS

A. EMPLOYMENT			
DO YOU PLAN TO BE EMPLOYED NEXT FALL?	PERCENTAGE OF SENIORS MARKING EACH OPTION		
	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
FULL-TIME	33.83	23.15	28.81
PART-TIME	40.53	55.96	47.79
MILITARY	4.67	.56	2.74
OTHER	5.80	1.13	3.60
NO OR UNDECIDED	15.15	19.17	17.04
B. POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION			
ARE YOU PLANNING ON POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION OR TRAINING NEXT FALL?	PERCENTAGE OF SENIORS MARKING EACH OPTION		
	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
FULL-TIME	40.37	60.88	50.00
PART-TIME	24.15	23.61	23.89
NO OR UNDECIDED	35.47	15.50	26.10
C. ENROLLMENT			
DO YOU PLAN TO ENROLL IN ONE OF THE FOLLOWING NEXT FALL?	PERCENTAGE OF SENIORS MARKING EACH OPTION		
	MALES	FEMALES	TOTAL
4-YEAR COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY	38.98	48.28	43.36
2-YEAR COLLEGE	26.62	38.85	32.39
APPLIED TECHNOLOGY CENTER	7.00	2.85	5.05
OTHER JOB TRAINING	7.26	4.28	5.85
NO PLANS TO ENROLL	20.12	5.71	13.33

# APPENDIX B CONTINUED

## Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program Low Implementing High Schools

TABLE 3

### STUDENT EVALUATIONS OF THEIR HIGH SCHOOL EXPERIENCE

A. STUDENT RATINGS OF COURSES						
COURSES	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MARKING EACH SCALE POINT					
	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	GOOD	FAIR	POOR	NO RESPONSE
ENGLISH	26.80	34.13	28.60	8.40	1.73	.33
MATHEMATICS	20.30	25.18	30.19	17.63	5.81	.86
SOCIAL STUDIES (HISTORY, GOVERNMENT, PSYCHOLOGY, ETC.)	20.92	29.94	32.35	12.43	2.74	1.60
NATURAL SCIENCES (BIOLOGY, CHEMISTRY, PHYSICS, ETC.)	17.91	29.46	31.14	14.63	4.76	2.08
FOREIGN LANGUAGES	10.71	16.03	25.33	19.47	10.37	18.05
FINE ARTS (MUSIC, ART, ETC.)	22.31	23.52	25.47	13.10	4.77	10.81
PHYSICAL EDUCATION	23.77	25.51	30.14	14.19	4.08	2.27
APPLIED TECHNOLOGY (HOME ECONOMICS, INDUSTRIAL ARTS, BUSINESS, ETC.)	15.66	20.05	28.02	12.76	4.45	19.04
OTHER COURSES	19.09	20.51	32.00	9.08	1.70	17.60

B. OVERALL EVALUATION OF HIGH SCHOOL PREPARATION			
HOW WELL DID THIS HIGH SCHOOL PREPARE YOU FOR A JOB?	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MARKING EACH SCALE POINT	HOW WELL DID THIS HIGH SCHOOL PREPARE YOU FOR CONTINUING YOUR EDUCATION?	PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS MARKING EACH SCALE POINT
VERY WELL	8.70	VERY WELL	15.64
MORE THAN ADEQUATELY	16.44	MORE THAN ADEQUATELY	19.89
ADEQUATELY	49.62	ADEQUATELY	48.47
LESS THAN ADEQUATELY	12.50	LESS THAN ADEQUATELY	8.15
VERY POORLY	5.28	VERY POORLY	2.98
NO OPINION/NOT SURE	7.44	NO OPINION/NOT SURE	4.84

## APPENDIX B CONTINUED

### Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program Low Implementing High Schools

TABLE 4

#### SUBJECT AREA ENROLLMENT FOR ALL SENIORS RESPONDING

SUBJECT AREA IN GRADES 9-12	PERCENTAGE OF SENIORS WHO HAVE TAKEN AT LEAST		
	2 YEARS	3 YEARS	4 YEARS +
1. ENGLISH OR LITERATURE	98.87	98.34	94.69
2. FOREIGN LANGUAGE	66.64	16.77	4.90
3. HISTORY OR SOCIAL STUDIES	96.15	82.82	20.15
4. MATHEMATICS	97.67	80.23	39.19
5. SCIENCE	94.36	62.99	23.54
6. ART	49.13	22.41	13.06
7. MUSIC	22.34	13.72	8.88
8. PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND HEALTH	74.93	40.38	21.08

## APPENDIX B CONTINUED

### Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program Low Implementing High Schools

TABLE 5

#### ENROLLMENT IN SPECIFIC COURSES FOR ALL SENIORS RESPONDING

COURSE	PERCENTAGE TAKING EACH COURSE
1. ALGEBRA I (1ST YEAR)	84.48
2. ALGEBRA II (2ND YEAR)	73.54
3. ADVANCED ALGEBRA	41.71
4. GEOMETRY	74.93
5. TRIGONOMETRY	39.38
6. APPLIED MATH I	14.19
7. APPLIED MATH II	10.07
8. BIOLOGY	89.32
9. CHEMISTRY	49.46
10. PHYSICS	27.71
11. COMPUTER RELATED COURSE	70.62
12. ADVANCED PLACEMENT HISTORY/ GOVERNMENT/ECONOMICS	30.83
13. ADVANCED PLACEMENT ENGLISH	26.79
14. ADVANCED PLACEMENT MATHEMATICS/CALCULUS	18.23
15. ADVANCED PLACEMENT SCIENCE	17.30
16. ADVANCED PLACEMENT FOREIGN LANGUAGE	8.81
17. ADVANCED PLACEMENT ARTS OR MUSIC	16.04
18. ADVANCED PLACEMENT COMPUTER SCIENCE	5.90

**APPENDIX B CONTINUED****Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program  
Low Implementing High Schools****TABLE 6****SUBJECT AREA ENROLLMENT FOR  
MALES AND FEMALES**

SUBJECT AREA IN GRADES 9-12	PERCENTAGE OF SENIORS WHO HAVE TAKEN AT LEAST:					
	2 YEARS		3 YEARS		4 YEARS +	
	MALES	FEMALES	MALES	FEMALES	MALES	FEMALES
1. ENGLISH OR LITERATURE	98.50	99.29	98.00	98.72	93.62	95.89
2. FOREIGN LANGUAGE	60.62	73.37	13.75	20.11	4.00	5.94
3. HISTORY OR SOCIAL STUDIES	95.62	96.74	79.25	86.96	18.50	21.95
4. MATHEMATICS	97.87	97.44	79.87	80.59	40.00	38.38
5. SCIENCE	92.87	96.03	63.00	63.17	26.12	20.67
6. ART	50.50	47.59	21.62	23.37	12.25	14.02
7. MUSIC	18.62	26.48	11.75	16.00	7.37	10.62
8. PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND HEALTH	77.00	72.66	43.87	36.40	24.25	17.42



**APPENDIX B CONTINUED****Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program  
Low Implementing High Schools****TABLE 7****ENROLLMENT OF MALES AND FEMALES  
IN SPECIFIC COURSES**

<b>COURSE</b>	<b>PERCENTAGE TAKING EACH COURSE</b>	
	<b>MALES</b>	<b>FEMALES</b>
1. ALGEBRA I (1ST YEAR)	82.62	86.68
2. ALGEBRA II (2ND YEAR)	71.62	75.77
3. ADVANCED ALGEBRA	40.25	43.48
4. GEOMETRY	72.75	77.33
5. TRIGONOMETRY	38.50	40.50
6. APPLIED MATH I	15.75	12.46
7. APPLIED MATH II	11.50	8.49
8. BIOLOGY	88.75	89.94
9. CHEMISTRY	46.50	52.83
10. PHYSICS	30.87	24.22
11. COMPUTER RELATED COURSE	67.75	73.79
12. ADVANCED PLACEMENT HISTORY/ GOVERNMENT/ECONOMICS	28.37	33.56
13. ADVANCED PLACEMENT ENGLISH	20.37	33.99
14. ADVANCED PLACEMENT MATHEMATICS/CALCULUS	19.75	16.57
15. ADVANCED PLACEMENT SCIENCE	18.62	15.86
16. ADVANCED PLACEMENT FOREIGN LANGUAGE	7.87	9.91
17. ADVANCED PLACEMENT ARTS OR MUSIC	14.25	17.98
18. ADVANCED PLACEMENT COMPUTER SCIENCE	6.62	5.09

## APPENDIX B CONTINUED

### Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program Now Implementing High Schools

**TABLE 8**  
**SUBJECT ENROLLMENT FOR SENIORS**  
**IN SPECIFIC PROGRAM EMPHASIS AREAS**

SUBJECT AREA IN GRADES 9-12	PERCENTAGE TAKING EACH COURSE								
	2 YEARS			3 YEARS			4 YEARS +		
	COLLEGE	VOC/ TECH	GEN	COLLEGE	VOC/ TECH	GEN	COLLEGE	VOC/ TECH	GEN
1. ENGLISH OR LITERATURE	99.22	96.36	98.97	99.03	95.45	98.33	97.67	89.09	93.47
2. FOREIGN LANGUAGE	80.07	42.72	63.17	22.24	11.81	14.32	6.96	1.81	4.09
3. HISTORY OR SOCIAL STUDIES	96.90	95.45	95.90	87.04	82.72	81.45	23.01	20.90	19.05
4. MATHEMATICS	98.64	96.36	97.44	90.71	68.18	75.06	52.22	24.54	32.86
5. SCIENCE	97.29	90.90	93.34	79.68	44.54	56.39	33.65	13.63	18.92
6. ART	41.00	57.27	54.34	16.05	30.90	26.21	9.67	11.81	15.98
7. MUSIC	24.17	12.72	22.88	16.82	9.09	12.65	11.60	4.54	8.18
8. PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND HEALTH	75.43	68.18	76.21	38.68	40.90	41.30	20.50	19.09	20.97

## APPENDIX B CONTINUED

### Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program Low Implementing High Schools

TABLE 9

#### ENROLLMENT IN COURSES FOR SENIORS IN SPECIFIC PROGRAM EMPHASIS AREAS

COURSE	PERCENTAGE TAKING EACH COURSE		
	COLLEGE	VOC/TECH	GENERAL
1. ALGEBRA I (1ST YEAR)	89.36	78.18	83.24
2. ALGEBRA II (2ND YEAR)	87.81	54.54	68.54
3. ADVANCED ALGEBRA	62.08	20.90	32.22
4. GEOMETRY	86.46	57.27	70.97
5. TRIGONOMETRY	64.41	12.72	27.74
6. APPLIED MATH I	10.63	21.81	15.47
7. APPLIED MATH II	9.09	14.54	9.84
8. BIOLOGY	92.64	80.90	89.25
9. CHEMISTRY	68.47	27.27	40.79
10. PHYSICS	38.68	19.09	23.01
11. COMPUTER RELATED COURSE	71.76	67.27	71.35
12. ADVANCED PLACEMENT HISTORY/ GOVERNMENT/ECONOMICS	51.25	13.63	20.84
13. ADVANCED PLACEMENT ENGLISH	39.84	13.63	20.97
14. ADVANCED PLACEMENT MATHEMATICS/CALCULUS	35.00	6.36	9.84
15. ADVANCED PLACEMENT SCIENCE	30.36	6.36	10.86
16. ADVANCED PLACEMENT FOREIGN LANGUAGE	13.15	7.27	6.90
17. ADVANCED PLACEMENT ARTS OR MUSIC	19.92	12.72	13.04
18. ADVANCED PLACEMENT COMPUTER SCIENCE	6.76	6.36	5.37

## APPENDIX B CONTINUED

### Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program Low Implementing High Schools

TABLE 10

#### ENROLLMENT IN VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL COURSES FOR ALL STUDENTS RESPONDING

COURSE	PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS WHO HAVE TAKEN AT LEAST:			
	NO CLASSES	1-2 CLASSES	3-4 CLASSES	5 OR MORE
1. AGRICULTURE	65.71	12.58	3.63	1.12
2. BUSINESS	27.98	56.08	10.73	2.45
3. HEALTH OCCUPATIONS	32.55	51.39	5.17	1.06
4. HOME ECONOMICS	35.61	47.14	8.48	1.92
5. INDUSTRIAL ARTS	46.48	34.87	12.06	3.91
6. MARKETING	57.69	21.34	2.51	.53
7. COOPERATIVE WORK EXPERIENCE	54.31	24.52	5.36	1.59

**APPENDIX B CONTINUED****Profile of Students in Comprehensive Guidance Program  
Low Implementing High Schools****TABLE 11****ENROLLMENT IN VOCATIONAL/TECHNICAL COURSES  
FOR MALES AND FEMALES**

COURSE	PERCENTAGE OF HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS WHO HAVE TAKEN AT LEAST:							
	NO CLASSES		1-2 CLASSES		3-4 CLASSES		5 OR MORE	
	MALES	FEMALES	MALES	FEMALES	MALES	FEMALES	MALES	FEMALES
1. AGRICULTURE	59.25	73.08	15.61	9.20	4.99	2.12	2.12	.00
2. BUSINESS	29.75	26.06	50.99	61.89	8.49	13.31	2.12	2.83
3. HEALTH OCCUPATIONS	30.25	35.26	49.74	53.25	4.87	5.52	1.12	.99
4. HOME ECONOMICS	43.37	26.91	34.62	61.32	3.87	13.73	1.50	2.40
5. INDUSTRIAL ARTS	37.00	57.36	43.24	25.34	17.49	5.80	6.12	1.41
6. MARKETING	52.00	64.16	24.62	17.69	3.87	.98	.87	.14
7. COOPERATIVE WORK EXPERIENCE	51.62	57.36	24.24	24.91	6.37	4.24	2.00	1.13

